



**Department of Early Childhood Education
Promotion and Tenure Document**

**Department of Early Childhood Education
PTRM Committee
Academic Year 2015-2016**

Revised: December 3, 2012

Additions: March 27, 2013

Approved: December 6, 2015

Revised: February 26, 2016

Table of Contents

Standards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	4
Department of Early Childhood Education Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	8
Department of Early Childhood Education Process for Merit Review	10
Promotion and Tenure Process	21
Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review	29
First Year Faculty	36
Reappointment of Second Year Faculty	39
Reappointment of Third through Fifth Year Faculty	41
Third-Year Review	42
Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Review	45
Amendment and Mandatory Review of the Department of Early Childhood Education Document	55
Appendix A	56
Appendix B	58
Appendix C	59
Appendix D	62
Appendix E	63
Appendix F	64
Appendix G	65

Department of Early Childhood Education

Promotion and Tenure Document

Promotion and tenure are dependent on a formal review of each faculty member's performance in three main categories. These are *Teaching* (including advising), *Scholarship*, and *Service*. As parts of a whole, each category allows faculty opportunities to demonstrate their ability to contribute to the overall mission of the university and more specifically, to the mission of the college.

Standards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Teaching

Teaching is the primary mission of Towson University and the primary responsibility of each faculty member. Faculty members are expected to model exemplary teaching practices and should be rated as excellent in this area. As described in *Appendix 3 To The Towson University Policy on Appointment Rank and Tenure of Faculty*, teaching performance will be evaluated from the following evidence submitted by the candidate:

- Peer evaluations (Appendix A)
- Student course evaluations;
- Self-evaluation; and
- Course materials

Advising

Academic advising is another component of excellence in the overall category of teaching. While the process of advising differs between undergraduate and graduate programs all advisors are expected to:

- Be accessible to assist students with academic questions;
- Be knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures;
- Provide accurate and timely information to students; and
- Be professional in relating to students.
- Assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their professional goals;
- Provide assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action;
- Other forms of advising may include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, and serving on a graduate research committee.

The students in the Department of Early Childhood Education evaluate the effectiveness of the advising process utilizing the ECED Academic Advising Evaluation Form. The form is completed and submitted to the Department of Early Childhood Education (Appendix B).

Scholarship

"University scholarship is scholarship that fulfills the mission of the University, in particular, the unit with which the faculty member is affiliated and utilizes the academic or professional expertise of the faculty member" (UniSCOPE, 2000, p. 2). As the "State's Metropolitan University" with "certification and

professional development of educators” central to the University's future (*Towson University Mission Statement*), we define and articulate scholarship relative to the university’s mission, and specifically as scholarship pertains to the unique roles and responsibilities of College of Education and the Department of Early Childhood Education faculty.

Utilizing UniSCOPE (2000) as a guiding framework scholarship can be defined as ...the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge ... informed by current knowledge in the field and [is] characterized by creativity and openness to new information, debate, and criticism. For scholarly activity to be recognized, utilized, and rewarded, it must be shared with others in appropriate ways. (p. 2)

Articulated within Appendix 3 the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (ART Policy) are four forms of scholarship that guide our work at Towson University.

Table 1: Four Forms of Scholarship (as articulated in Towson University ART Policy)

Forms of Scholarship	Definition
Scholarship of Application	applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the university, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts
Scholarship of Discovery	traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts
Scholarship of Integration	applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines;
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

The scholarship of *discovery* is often considered “traditional” scholarship, and a category frequently used for promotion and tenure decisions at institutions of higher education. However, embedded within the mission of a *metropolitan university*, a category akin to the traditions of the land grant institution, scholarship seeks to link “basic investigations with practical application” (The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU), *Declaration of Metropolitan University*, <http://www.cumuonline.org/about/declaration.htm>, Retrieved April 16, 2007)). In the land grant model, members of the surrounding community brought to the university practical problems and issues that were relevant to their locale. Problems were contextual to the immediate population with solutions focusing on pragmatic applications, addressing the immediate needs within the community. The metropolitan university, therefore, seeks to forge “interdisciplinary partnerships [within the community] for attacking complex metropolitan problems” (CUMU).

The metropolitan university cultivates a close relationship with the urban center and its suburbs, often serving as a catalyst for change and source of enlightened discussion. Leaders in government and business agree that education is the key to prosperity, and that metropolitan universities will be on the cutting edge of education not only for younger students, but also for those who must continually re-educate themselves to meet the challenges of the future. (<http://www.cumuonline.org/about/index.htm>, Retrieved April 16, 2007)

In light of the mission of a metropolitan university, the scholarship categories that are germane to the workload of COE and ECED faculty, and the ones that will take a central role in promotion and tenure criteria are the categories of *application*, *integration*, and *teaching*. Our goal is for a representation of scholarship that is more

inclusive than that of traditional scholarship of discovery and openly acknowledging that “Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes on many forms” (ART Document, p. 13). In addition, we agree with the following statement in the ART Policy:

Faculty will be guided by the definitions of scholarship defined above and *as articulated by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the College of Education* on the basis of disciplinary/interdisciplinary intellectual interests. (ART Document, p. 14. *Emphasis added*)

In Table 2, there are examples of activities and products for each form of scholarship. This list is not inclusive of all products that faculty may use for the evaluation of scholarship, and faculty may add products they deem relevant to their work.

Table 2: Sample activities and products embedded within scholarship

Form of Scholarship	Sample Activities	Sample Products
<p><u>Scholarship of Application</u>: applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the university</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School consulting • State/LEA consulting • Applied research in university settings • Applied research in school settings. • Training/Consulting collaboratively with the community, a cluster of schools, a school system, a university/college, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to committees or groups • Workshops for schools and community groups • Accreditation report • New program development • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Materials developed in support of MSDE committee work (new courses, standards, etc.) • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Evaluation of a university/college, school system program or grant including scholarship of another individual’s work.
<p><u>Scholarship of Discovery</u>: traditional research, including knowledge for its own sake</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic research • Evaluation research • Review, critique, or synthesis of existing research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants and contracts awarded • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Presentations at conferences
<p><u>Scholarship of Integration</u>: applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-disciplinary/cross-department research/study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of book • Publication of a chapter in a book • Publication of articles in refereed journals (print or on-line) • Publication in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries
<p><u>Scholarship of Teaching</u>: exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher research of one’s own teaching and student learning • Writing an accreditation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials/Publications designed to reach an audience of practitioners, parents, students, or other members of the community • New program development • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Overseeing the development of new cohort groups • Designing and/or providing materials for adjunct faculty on and off campus • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries.

Service

Faculty members are responsible for service to the Department of Early Childhood Education, College of Education, the University, the discipline, and the broader community, including collaborations and partnerships with practitioners in the field. Service may also include civic service ‘that may or may not be directly related to one’s academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university’s mission’ (ART Document, p. 14) It is expected that ECED faculty demonstrate their commitment to service as documented by activities such as:

- Membership on department, college, and university committees and task forces;
- Leadership positions in the department, college, and university governance structure;
- Involvement in the work of practitioners in the field of early childhood education and human services;
- Involvement in professional organizations and associations at the state, regional, national, or international level; and
- Service to the community.

Department of Early Childhood Education Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Overview of Annual Review and Reappointment

All faculty, tenured and tenure-track, shall be evaluated annually according to the procedures and criteria described herein.

All faculty, programs, departments, and colleges shall abide by both the USM and the Towson University Annual Review and Reappointment (Section VI). The processes, procedures, and cycle for all evaluations (annual, reappointment) shall follow the general and appropriate specific policies described herein.

All faculty shall complete the current version of the Annual Report (AR) and Workload Agreement, (see Section VII) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. Department chairs shall assist continuing faculty with the development and approval of the Workload Agreement. Such workload expectations shall be aligned with department, college and university goals based on the department, college and university missions and visions.

Each fall, an Annual Review shall be completed for each tenured and tenure-track faculty member holding a full-time contract. It shall be included in the evaluation portfolio.

The chair of the department shall comply with the Towson University Annual Review, and ensure that evaluation portfolios meet all format requirements.

Documentation and Material: The Evaluation Portfolio

The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review and reappointment rests with the faculty member. 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 his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review and reappointment contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria.

1. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio.
2. 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*;

- 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;
 - ii. grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- e. documentation of scholarship and service.
- f. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

Timeline for Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

The Third Friday in September

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.

(The faculty member or his/her chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third- Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar.)

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. **Faculty on sabbatical may vote if they have reviewed material and are present at the meeting.** College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

The Fourth Friday in October

The department PTRM committee's report with recommendations 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 and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTRM chairperson to the dean's office.

November 30

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

Department of Early Childhood Education Process for Merit Review

Annual Review for Merit

The Department of Early Childhood Education Merit committee shall annually review faculty for merit as appropriate.

In conjunction with guidelines issued by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty or section AR II of the Annual Report form or section CAR II of the Chairperson's Annual Report form shall serve as the basis for merit evaluation. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their AR or CAR Part II.

Each faculty member shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during the academic year, to which the evaluation applies as outlined in the section —Documentation and Material Inclusion (below). The faculty member shall submit the evaluation portfolio to the department chair no later than the third Friday in June.

The annual review for merit shall be conducted and completed no later than during the fall semester following the academic calendar year under review. The department chair shall be responsible for presenting to the department merit committee all the evaluation portfolios for all faculty members in the department.

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

All votes regarding comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

The department Merit committee shall evaluate these evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the department PTRM document) and submitted to the department chair no later than the second Friday in October.

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

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of the department chairperson'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.

The department chairperson shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the faculty member's annual report, the student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the department Merit recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

The department Merit committee chairperson shall forward the evaluation portfolio, Merit and chair recommendations and the department vote count record to the dean's office by the second Friday in November.

By the first Friday in February, the dean shall review the department recommendations and forward them to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall notify the department chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the second Friday in February.

Faculty may appeal a negative recommendation for merit at any point in the process, following the procedures outlined below; however, the appeal shall not stay the merit review process.

The Provost shall review and approve or deny merit recommendations. The Provost's decision on merit is final; there is no appeal from the Provost's decision.

Standards and Criteria Used in Evaluation of Faculty Performance

There are three (3) categories of merit as follows:

- **Not Meritorious:** Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
- **Satisfactory (Base Merit):** Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, college, and department.
- **Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit):** Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

To qualify for merit in the Department of Early Childhood Education, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations. Faculty is eligible to apply each year at the department level for merit.

Standards and Criteria Used in Evaluation of Lecturers Performance

All full-time lecturers in the Early Childhood Education Department are eligible for department merit if appropriate materials are submitted and performance is judged meritorious. Lecturers are required to go through this review and feedback process although funding for merit increases may be unavailable.

1. Lecturers shall complete an Annual Review, Parts I and II, parallel to that completed by tenure track faculty.
2. The normal teaching requirement for a Lecturer is eight course units per academic year, which shall provide 80% of workload on the Annual Review.

3. A Lecturer shall be responsible for 20% of workload on the Annual Review divided between maintenance (*emphasis added*) of disciplinary and teaching currency (scholarship) and service to the department or University. Neither scholarship nor service may account for less than 5% of the annual workload.

- a. A Lecturer shall report on the Annual Review what active steps (*emphasis added*) have been taken during the year to maintain or enhance disciplinary and teaching currency, relevant to the courses in the Lecturer's teaching program, through a program of reading, investigation, training, or presentation.
- b. A Lecturer shall report on the Annual Review activities during the year that constitute service to the department or the University. Service may include participation in planning and orientation meetings, committee membership, work with students beyond the classroom, or other activities as agreed upon with the department chair.

Teaching is the primary mission of Towson University. In the College of Education teaching takes on heightened importance, and is the core responsibility of all Lecturers. The three merit classifications are:

- **Not Meritorious** – Lecturers who have not met departmental expectations and/or were not rated satisfactory in teaching.
- **Satisfactory (Base Merit)** – Lecturers who have met departmental expectations and are rated satisfactory in teaching.
- **Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit)**: Excellence in teaching and scholarship or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.
- **Lecturers on leave** – Lecturers on leave for the year can request that the Merit Committee excuse them from the evaluation process.

Lecturers will submit their dossiers following the same requirements as tenure-track and tenured faculty (see Policies and Procedures).

To qualify for merit in the Department of Early Childhood Education, lecturers shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations. Lecturers are eligible to apply each year at the department level for merit.

Standards for Merit

It is the responsibility of lecturers to document and articulate the rationale for the level of merit for which they believe they are eligible when they submit their materials for merit review.

Not Meritorious-(COLA Only).

Faculty whose performance fails to meet adequately even satisfactory standards in one or more of the following areas: teaching/advising, scholarship, service. However, a Faculty member not meeting the Satisfactory standard for teaching/advising will be considered Not Meritorious no matter if standards are met in the other areas of faculty work: scholarship and service. The ratings are based upon a review of the previous year's AR II document and reported in the AR I document. The faculty member may receive cost of living allowance (COLA), if provided by the University. In addition, the members of the Department of Early Childhood Education PTRM Committee and the Department Chair are to write a plan to serve as a guide for the further professional growth and development of the faculty member.

Satisfactory-(Base Merit plus COLA)

A Faculty member in the Department of Early Childhood Education who meets the established standards in this document must have earned satisfactory performance in teaching, scholarship, *and* service. This will be based upon a review of the previous year’s AR II document as reported in the current year’s AR I document. The members of the Department of Early Childhood Education’s PTRM Committee and the Department Chair shall provide a memorandum detailing the faculty member’s accomplishments and suggestions for on-going professional development.

1. Teaching

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and Tenure track faculty will document satisfactory teaching in AR and portfolio evaluation for <u>all</u> of the following evidence:</p> <p>Teaching Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment with means ranging from 3.0-3.9 for each course with generally positive qualitative comments. • Positive annual peer evaluation included in dossier • Inclusion of appropriate syllabi and schedule for each course taught in dossier • Positive student evaluations of advising (if applicable that academic year) • Meeting faculty member’s correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I. • Supervising existing cohort and coordinating PDS sites • Other: _____ 	<p>Lecturers will document <i>satisfactory</i> in teaching in AR and portfolio evaluation for <u>all</u> of the following evidence:</p> <p>Teaching Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment with means ranging from 3.0-3.9 for each course with generally positive qualitative comments. • Positive annual peer evaluation included in dossier • Inclusion of appropriate syllabi and schedule for each course taught in dossier • Positive student evaluations of advising (if applicable that academic year) • Meeting faculty member’s correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I. • Supervising existing cohort and coordinating PDS sites • Other: _____

2. Scholarship

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and Tenure track faculty will document Scholarship activities, such as the following (not inclusive), will be considered evidence of <i>satisfactory</i> performance (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Submitted a proposal or paper for possible presentation or publication ○ Submitted a proposal for a grant or award to an internal/external agency 	<p>Lecturers will document application of scholarship to improve teaching effectiveness, such as the following (not inclusive), will be considered evidence of <i>satisfactory</i> performance (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Syllabi include current reading materials and resources from reputable sources. ○ Collaborated with other faculty members to submit a proposal or paper for possible presentation or publication

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collected and analyzed data for a research study and/or a future presentation/paper ○ Presented a roundtable or poster session at a national, regional, state or local professional conference or school ○ Reviewed professional work such as a paper or text ○ Attended professional conference(s) related to his/her expertise ○ Studied an area new to the faculty member and needed by an ECED, COE, or University program ○ Submitted professional work to a colleague for critique ○ Published a non-peer-reviewed work, such as newsletter, book review, website, etc. ○ Collaborated with others institutionally and cross-institutionally on projects that will lead to scholarly activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collected and analyzed data to document student progress on signature assignments ○ Attended a national, regional, state or local professional conference or school for professional development ○ Modified syllabi to reflect innovative teaching practices in higher education <i>Applicable to teaching</i> ○ Reviewed professional work such as a paper or text for journal or other publication / presentation ○ Studied an area new to the faculty member and needed by ECED, COE, or University program ○ Submitted professional work or syllabi to a colleague for critique
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Service

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and tenure track faculty service activities, such as the following (not inclusive), will be considered evidence of <i>satisfactory</i> performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served actively on departmental, college, university or community committees • Volunteered to perform tasks, as requested by the Chair or Departmental committee, needed to improve or continue the Departmental programs • Served actively in an advisory group that advanced the mission of Towson University • Engaged students in a significant service learning project • Demonstrated professional competence in consulting activities • Other _____ 	<p>Lecturers service activities, such as the following (not inclusive), will be considered evidence of satisfactory performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served actively on departmental, college, university or community committees • Volunteered to perform tasks, as requested by the Chair or Departmental committee, needed to improve or continue the Departmental programs • Other _____

Excellent-(Base Merit Plus One Performance Merit plus COLA)

In order for a faculty member in the Department of Early Childhood Education to meet the Excellent standard, the faculty member must earn an Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories. These ratings will be based upon a review of the previous year's AR II document as reported in the current year's AR I document. The members of the Department of Early Childhood Education's PTRM Committee and the Department Chair shall provide a memorandum detailing the faculty member's accomplishment along with comments regarding suggestions for on-going professional development.

1. Teaching

Tenured and Tenure Track faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and tenure track faculty will document <i>excellence</i> in teaching by meeting criteria for <i>satisfactory</i> and evidence of exceptional teaching (if applicable): Teaching Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment with means ranging from 4.0-5.0 for each course with overall positive qualitative comments. • Positive annual peer evaluation included in dossier • Inclusion of appropriate syllabi, schedule, and other instructional materials for each course taught in dossier • Evidence of successful collaboration with colleagues on students' success among courses. *Co-teaching special courses or topics within courses *development of instructional plan for students *sharing and/or designing materials with colleagues for courses <p>Non-classroom assignments which are part of your regular load teaching assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision of interns with positive evaluations • Effective directorship and/or coordination of programs • Coach and/or mentor junior faculty, adjuncts, and/or lecturers in teaching and/or advising on and off campus sites. <p>New instructional procedures which you have introduced or developed this year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of special projects • Development of new courses • Development of new materials <p>Advising (if applicable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent student evaluations of advising • Successful advising of student associations <p>Professional Development Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of the development of a new partnership or PDS relationship <p>Completion of Annual Report and Dossier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeding faculty member's correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I. • Other 	<p>Lecturers will document <i>excellence</i> in teaching by meeting criteria for <i>satisfactory</i> and evidence of exceptional teaching (if applicable): Teaching Assignments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment with means ranging from 4.0-5.0 for each course with overall positive qualitative comments. • Positive annual peer evaluation included in dossier • Inclusion of appropriate syllabi, schedule, and other instructional materials for each course taught in dossier • Evidence of successful collaboration with colleagues on students' success among courses.*Co-teaching special courses or topics within courses; *development of instructional plan for students; *sharing and/or designing materials with colleagues for courses <p>Non-classroom assignments which are part of your regular load teaching assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision of interns with positive evaluations • Effective directorship and/or coordination of programs • Coach and/or mentor junior faculty, adjuncts, and/or other lecturers in teaching and/or advising on and off campus sites. <p>New instructional procedures which you have introduced or developed this year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of special projects • Development of new courses • Development of new materials <p>Advising (if applicable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent student evaluations of advising • Successful advising of student associations <p>Professional Development Schools: Coordination of the development of a new partnership or PDS relationship</p> <p>Completion of Annual Report and Dossier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeding lecturers member's correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I. • Other

2. Scholarship

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and tenure track faculty will document <i>excellence</i> in scholarship by meeting criteria for Satisfactory and additional evidence of exceptional scholarship (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acceptance of a peer reviewed article, chapter, or book for publication ○ Received a grant or award from an external/internal agency ○ Presented a workshop, thematic session, or research paper at an international, national, or regional conference (i.e., proposal was accepted by or invitation was issued from the conference organization) ○ Served on the editorial board of a state, regional, or national publication ○ Supported students in preparing research for presentation at a national meeting or submission for publication ○ Received recognition of high distinction of a professional nature (for teaching—which demonstrated outstanding scholarship--or for scholarship alone) ○ Mentored junior faculty in scholarship by collaborating in writing manuscripts ○ Authored or played a major role in the development of a Department, College, or University document (e.g. accreditation document, PTRM document, white paper) ○ Played a major role in developing or revising a program for the University, College, or Department ○ Collaborated with others institutionally and cross-institutionally that resulted in scholarly activities and or product ○ Other 	<p>Lecturers will document <i>excellence</i> in application of scholarship to improve teaching and/or to contribute to excellence in the department of ECED by meeting criteria for Satisfactory and additional evidence of exceptional scholarship (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Published a non peer-reviewed work, such as newsletter, book review, website, etc. ○ Submitted a proposal or paper for possible presentation or publication ○ Presented a roundtable or poster session at a national, regional, state or local professional conference or school ○ Evidence that attending conferences or other professional development activity impacted teaching ○ Collaborated with other faculty to submit a proposal for a grant or award to an internal/external agency ○ Supported students in preparing research for presentation for other students in the department, college, or University. ○ Received recognition of high distinction of a professional nature (for teaching—which demonstrated outstanding scholarship--or for scholarship alone) ○ Authored or played a major role in the development of a Department, College, or University document (e.g. accreditation document, PTRM document, white paper) ○ Played a major role in developing or revising a program for the University, College, or Department ○ Other

3. Service

Tenured and Tenure Track faculty	Lecturers
<p>Tenured and tenure track faculty will document <i>excellence</i> in service by meeting criteria for Satisfactory and additional evidence of exceptional service (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaired or directed an active committee, advisory group, or program (not part of assigned time) that advance the mission of Towson University • Served effectively as faculty advisor for a student group • Served actively on the School Improvement Team for a PDS, policy council, and PDS activities. • Elected as an executive of a professional organization directly related to one’s areas of expertise • Conducted ongoing professional consulting relationships with a given entity • Received recognition of high distinction for service • Mentored other faculty in service • Other 	<p>Lecturers will document <i>excellence</i> in service by meeting criteria for Satisfactory and additional evidence of exceptional service (if applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served actively in a committee, advisory group, or program (not part of assigned time) that advance the mission of Towson University • Served effectively as advisor for a student group • Volunteered to lead tasks, as requested by the Chair or Departmental committee, needed to improve or continue the Departmental programs • Served actively on the School Improvement Team for a PDS, other policy council (e.g., Head Start), and PDS committees and activities. • Officer and/or committee member for regional/national professional organization • Other

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding merit shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.

There are three (3) types of appeals.

Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either department merit committee, the department chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. The

next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person, to the dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.

All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate Merit committee chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the dean, the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below. Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM committee.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the dean and the university PTRM committee chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the university PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Recommendations of the university PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the university PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for merit rests with the faculty member. The annual review evaluation portfolio is utilized to determine level of merit to be awarded.

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 his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for merit contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. (See the above section on Annual Review for documentation to include.)

During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or the chairperson of the Department of Early Childhood Education participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in September. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

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. The Dean will send a copy to the department chair of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

If the chairperson or program director 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 tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form (see Section VII). A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

Copies of the chairperson's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

Timeline For Merit Review

The First Friday in May

Department Merit committees are formed.

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

The Third Friday in September

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.

The Second Friday in October

Department Merit committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October

The department chairperson may place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. The department Merit 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 Merit 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

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

The First Friday in February

The dean shall review the department recommendations and forward them to the provost

The Second Friday in February

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.

Promotion and Tenure Process

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

By the fourth Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member is to undergo tenure or promotion, the department chair shall notify all members of the department of those intentions and shall confirm those intentions to the dean and the Provost.

The department PTRM Committee shall evaluate faculty for tenure and/or promotion.

The department PTRM committee(s) shall review evaluation portfolios for promotion and/or tenure and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the department PTRM document) and submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October.

The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

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. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The department PTRM committee chairperson shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record to the dean's office by the second Friday in November, where they will be available to members of the college PTRM committee.

The college PTRM committee shall consider the Evaluation Record relative to tenure and/or promotion. It shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The statement with recommendation and vote count shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and submitted to the dean by the first Friday in January.

The dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to each faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the third Friday in January.

The recommendations of the college PTRM committee and the dean shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the third Friday in January. Copies also shall be sent to the department chair and the department PTRM committee chairperson. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The dean shall forward the summative portfolio for each faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure to the Provost by the first Friday in February.

The Provost may ask the dean, the department chairperson, or the department and/or college PTRM committee for additional information from the lengthier evaluation portfolio prior to making a final recommendation. The Provost shall prepare a substantive letter of recommendation regarding tenure to be sent to the faculty member, department and college PTRM committee chairpersons, department chairperson, dean of the college and the President by the third Friday in March. A copy of this letter will be filed with the faculty member's official file maintained by the Office of the Provost.

In the event of a negative recommendation at any level of review, the faculty member may choose to challenge the recommendation through the appeals process; however, an appeal will not stay the evaluation process.

The awarding of tenure and/or promotion shall be made only by the President.

Tenure and/or promotion shall be effective on the date indicated in the official letter containing the President's decision.

Materials for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

The responsibility for presenting material for promotion and tenure rests with the faculty member.

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 his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

Evaluation portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II)
- current *Curriculum vitae*
- syllabi of courses taught
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect (2010-2011);
 - documentation of scholarship and service;
 - 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. If at any level confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

Copies of the chairperson's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion and tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost. 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 vita*
- A copy of *one* recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.

Section II

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

Section III

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

Section IV

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

Section V

- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form;
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson;
- Written recommendation of the college P&T committee; and
- Written recommendation of the academic dean.

Additional Documentation Responsibilities

The dean of the college shall assure that the summative portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.

The dean of the college shall have the responsibility of returning the supporting material to the department chair who shall then retain it for three (3) years following the date of the decision to grant or deny promotion or tenure. The materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

Standards for Promotion

This section outlines the standards for promotion and/or advancement to tenure. Each faculty member is responsible for showcasing his/her best work in each area of review: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. While excellence in teaching is paramount for successful promotion and tenure review at Towson University, without evidence of scholarship and the establishment of a scholarly agenda, tenure and promotion will not be granted. Table 3 outlines the standards from promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. Each department will set forth specific criteria for the categories listed below.

Following is a list of all faculty ranks for faculty with duties primarily in instruction used by the University:

Assistant Professor: The appointee shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research and in areas in which there is a critical shortage of doctorates. The appointee should also show potential for superior teaching, service, and research, scholarship, or where applicable, creative performance, commensurate with the University's mission.

Associate Professor. In addition to having the qualifications of an assistant professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and successful experience in research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of six years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research. There shall also be evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession.

Professor. In addition to having the qualifications of an associate professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and, where appropriate to the mission of Towson University, a national reputation. The appointee shall have a minimum of ten years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for faculty who has attained national distinction for comparable professional activity or research. There shall be continuing evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession.

Faculty will be guided by the expectations of teaching, scholarship, and service as *articulated by all levels; university, college, and department.*

Table 3: College of Education and Department of Early Childhood Education Standards for Promotion and

Tenure Advancement

	Promotion to Associate Professor and Advancement with Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent student evaluations • Excellent peer evaluations • Excellent course syllabi and instructional materials • Excellent evaluation of advising by students 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in teaching and advising.
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustained record of quality service to the university, college, department, community, and/or profession. 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in service to the university, college, and/or department. • Leadership in service to the profession.
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a programmatic anchor(s) for his/her scholarship • A sustained record of quality scholarship, including but not limited to, peer-reviewed conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications/successful grants 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of local, regional, national, or international expertise/reputation

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.

There are three (3) types of appeals.

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either department and/or college PTRM committees, the department chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member’s performance.

The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the college PTRM, dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.

Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean and the college PTRM committee.

All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM committee chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the college PTRM committee, the university PTRM committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President, whose decision is final.

2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.

Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM committee.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the dean and the university PTRM committee chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean, the college PTRM committee, the department chair, and the university PTRM committee chair. Appeal of the Provost's recommendations shall be copied to the dean and department chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the university PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Recommendations of the university PTRM committee may be appealed to the President, whose decision shall be final. The chair of the university PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

The President's decision on tenure and promotion shall be final.

Timeline for the Promotion and Tenure Process

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

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.

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 Third Friday in September

Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary). 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. 35

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.

The Fourth Friday in October

Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for promotion and tenure review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

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

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

The First Friday in January

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

The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The college PTRM committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

The First Friday in February

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 to the Provost.

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 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.

Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

Aside from simply showcasing teaching, scholarship, and service, each candidate will attend to the following items that are embedded within these categories. Failure to do so may result in an unfavorable review.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Tenure track faculty is required to show evidence of peer review of their teaching. The general process is as follows:

- Classroom/clinical 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.
- A minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per review period. The department PTRM committee will approve the peers selected for the review.
- Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
- Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the comprehensive five-year review.

In the event that a faculty member has consistent unsatisfactory student or peer evaluations of instruction, the department chair shall develop a remediation plan in consultation with the faculty member. This plan may include mentoring, additional classroom visitations, and/or instruction in teaching effectiveness. A plan shall be put in place regardless of the rank and/or tenure status of the faculty.

Peer Evaluation Visitation Activities

The following is a description of a process in preparation for peer reviews:

- The faculty member may request a pre-visitation conference to contextualize the lesson for the observers.
- Faculty members should provide any relevant material to the observer (e.g., the course syllabus, a lesson plan, lesson handouts)
- The observers must write an observation report and submit it to the instructor observed. This report will include:
 1. An objective description of the lesson activities; and
 2. A reaction statement which evaluates:
 - instructional strategies employed, including the instructor serving as a “facilitator of active learning” and modeling best practices;
 - objectives set and accomplished;
 - professional demeanor of the faculty member;
 - other (optional).

A post-observation conference will take place within two weeks of the observation. The observation report will be presented in writing to the instructor within four weeks of observation. The instructor should receive, read, and sign all materials at this time. The faculty member will have two weeks to attach additional or alternative relevant information to any of these materials.

Evaluation of Advising

Advising evaluation procedures will be developed by the department and/or program and minimally address the following criteria. Advisors are expected to:

- Be accessible to assist students with academic questions;
- Be knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures;
- Provide accurate and timely information to students;
- Be professional in relating to students;
- Assist students in the development of meaningful education plans that are compatible with their professional goals;
- Provide assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action; and
- Other forms of advising may include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class- teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, and serving on a graduate research committee.

ECED Academic Advising Evaluation Form is provided in Appendix 1.

Faculty Support

It is the responsibility of the Chair of the department to support a working plan for the faculty member's promotion. This includes:

1. Providing a teaching schedule and required service responsibilities that allow the instructor to protect time for scholarship; and
2. Meeting each semester with the faculty member in order to review and counsel him/her on perceived progress in developing a sustained record of scholarship.

In a case in which the candidate switched his or her department, the following two elements shall be considered:

1. If the candidate's years of service in the current department is less than, or equal to, one year, the candidate's application shall be reviewed by the applicant's prior department.
2. Otherwise, the candidate's application will be reviewed by the current department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Operating Procedures for Department of Early Childhood Education Promotion/Tenure, Review, and Merit Committee

This section will outline the operating procedures of the ECED PTRM committee, which includes committee membership, policies and procedures, and the roles and responsibilities of committee members. As determined by the University PTRM calendar, the ECED Committee will be constituted by the first Friday in May of the year preceding review.

The Department of Early Childhood Education has two committees for the PTRM process (TU ART document p.3-33).

1. The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR) Committee mentors new faculty in the tenure and promotion process and administers the system of faculty evaluation as designated by the ECE department, College of Education, and Towson University standards and procedures. It also reviews the petition of a faculty member for tenure, reappointment, and/or promotion.
2. The Merit Committee annually reviews and evaluates faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service for the purpose of recommending merit salary increases.

ECED Promotion and Tenure/Reappointment Committee (PTR)

1. Membership of the ECED Promotion and Tenure/Reappointment Committee (PTR)
 - a. The **Tenure Committee** for the Department of Early Childhood Education consists of all tenured members of the Department, regardless of rank, and those specified in the Towson University Faculty Handbook. The Department Chairperson serves as a non-voting member of the Tenure/Reappointment Committee.
 - b. The **Promotion/Reappointment Committee** for the Department of Early Childhood Education consists of all tenured members of the Department, regardless of rank, and those specified in the Towson University Faculty Handbook. The Department Chairperson serves as a non-voting member of all Promotion/Rank Committees. Membership of the committee will vary in the following situations:
 - i. Promotion Committee for review of promotion to Full Professor - all Full Professors in addition to the Department Chairperson. A minimum of three Professors is required for this vote.
 - ii. Promotion Committee for review of promotion to Associate Professor - all Full and Associate Professors in the addition to the Department Chairperson.
 - iii. If fewer than three faculty members are eligible to serve on the appropriate committee, the faculty member under review will recommend three faculty members from the College by the third Friday in June and the Department Chairperson and Dean will review the list and make recommendations by the first Friday in September.
2. Chair of the Tenure and Promotion/Reappointment (PTR) Committee:
 - a. The chair of the ECED PTR committee is a tenured member of the department and does not serve concurrently on the College PTR Committee.
 - b. The chair of the ECED PTR Committee is the only elected member of the committee. The chair is elected for a three year term at the first meeting of the committee. Any committee member may be selected by a majority vote of the committee. (A majority vote means more than half of the total.) Vacancies for the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure/Reappointment Committee are filled by a majority vote of the committee.
 - c. The chair coordinates departmental PTR procedures and activities. The chair prepares the meeting agendas, presides over all meetings, and oversees communication between the committee and the faculty/administration and candidate, and serves as liaison for all communication between the department, the University, and the College of Education PTR committees.
 - d. The PTR chairperson shall prepare a written report of the faculty member's evaluation that references his/her teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, in relation to the department's

- standards and expectations and submit the report to the department chairperson by the second Friday of October.
- e. The PTR chairperson shall forward the faculty member under review evaluation portfolio, inclusive of committee's and department chairperson's evaluations, to the Dean's office by the second Friday of November.
3. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of the faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
 4. A faculty member under consideration for promotion is ineligible to participate in the committee's deliberations in regard to his/her own dossier.
 5. Committee Policies, Duties, and Procedures
 - a. The ECED Department PTR committee shall follow the Towson University calendar to review and notify first year faculty members about reappointment by the third Friday of January, following the procedure outlined in Section III.D.2 (Reappointment: First Year Faculty) in ART.
 - b. Recommendations for tenure track faculty after the first year shall be notified in writing, following the procedures outlined in Section III.D.3-4 in ART. When the ECED tenure committee has concerns about a first year or tenure-track faculty member continuing in the department, the Department Chair and/or the PTR Chair will discuss these concerns with him/her.
 - c. Faculty members shall notify the chair of the department of his/her intention to submit promotion and/or tenure materials by the third Friday of the academic year preceding the academic year the materials will be submitted.
 - d. Dossiers for promotion are due by the third Friday in September.
 - e. A quorum consists of 50% plus one of the Committee members.
 - f. The Committee meets as many times as necessary to complete the business of the Committee.
 - g. The Committee uses the PTR approved criteria set forth by the department.
 - h. A majority vote is required to forward a candidate's materials for promotion and/or tenure.
 - i. All voting is by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the PTR committee chair. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless authorized by the Provost. In the case of a tie vote, the committee will continue deliberations and vote again until a majority decision is reached. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the voting results and the committee's recommendation to the next level of review and forward the confidential ballots to the Provost (see Appendix E).
 - j. Minutes of all meetings and votes will be kept by the chair of the committee and filed in the ECED office.
 - k. All deliberations are confidential. (see Appendix D)
 - l. All decisions and explanatory statements will be shared with the faculty candidate in a conference with the ECED Department Chair and Chair of the PTR Committee or another member of the committee as designated within 24 hours of the decision. Arrangements for the notification conference will be made prior to the Committee deliberations.

- m. An appeal of a negative recommendation shall be made in writing within 21 calendar days from the date the negative judgment is delivered in person. The faculty member shall follow the procedures for appeals outlined in the Appeals and Negative Recommendations section of ART.

ECED Merit Committee

1. Membership of the ECED Merit Committee

- a. Four faculty (three members and one alternate) are elected for ECED Merit Committee membership. The department chair sits on the committee as a non-voting member. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve on the Merit Committee for a term of one academic year. Committee membership will be determined as follows:
 - i. One full professor will be elected.
 - ii. One associate professor will be elected.
 - iii. One assistant professor will be elected.
 - iv. The department chairperson (non-voting)
 - v. One tenured/tenure-track faculty member will be elected as an at large alternate who joins the committee deliberations when a committee member's dossier is being discussed. In a year where there is no faculty at a particular rank an at large member of the committee will be elected.

2. Election of Merit Committee Members

- a. Election for Merit Committee Members will be held at the May department meeting. Voting will be by confidential ballot, listing by rank all eligible department members who agree to run. Each tenured/tenure-track faculty will vote for one member at each rank.

3. Vacancies

- a. If a temporary vacancy is created on the Merit Committee, an election will be held at the next department meeting to fill the vacancy until the original member returns.

4. Chair of the Merit Committee

- a. Any committee member may be selected as chair by a majority vote of the committee.

5. Quorum

- a. All members of the committee (or the alternate for one member) must be present to vote on merit decisions.

6. Procedures

- a. Full time faculty members will submit their portfolios to be reviewed for merit to the department chair no later than the third Friday in June. Faculty merit review portfolios will include a Merit Request/Justification statement which indicates the specific level of merit the faculty member is requesting and a list of the past year's merit criteria that justify requested merit level.
 - i. Merit Committee members will review the portfolios and Merit Requests of all full-time faculty members before their meeting to decide merit ratings. At the decision meeting, the committee will discuss the evaluations and attempt to reach consensus for each faculty member on a rating of not meritorious (COLA only), satisfactory (base merit), or excellent (base merit plus one performance merit).
 - ii. All deliberations of the Merit Committee are confidential. (see Appendix D)
 - iii. All voting is by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Merit committee chair. Since there are five members of the committee and all must be present, there will be no tie votes. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the voting results and the committee's recommendation to the next level of review and forward the confidential

ballots to the Provost.

- iv. The Merit Committee Chair will prepare a written report outlining the Level of Merit awarded, including vote count, and the justification for that level. The report shall reference the faculty member's teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, in relation to the department's standards and expectations and will be submitted to the department chairperson no later than the second Friday in October.
- v. The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
- vi. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member 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.
- vii. The department merit committee chairperson shall forward the evaluation portfolio, including the merit committee and chair recommendations, to the Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
- viii. The Merit Committee will follow the University PTRM calendar.
- ix. An appeal of a negative recommendation shall be made in writing within 21 calendar days from the date the negative judgment is delivered in person. The faculty member shall follow the procedures for appeals outlined in the Appeals and Negative Recommendations section of ART.

7. Materials for Merit Reviews

The Annual Report (AR) provides the framework to guide the individual faculty in developing their merit evaluation portfolio. The portfolio shall include all materials required for the Annual Review and, in addition, a Merit Request/Justification Statement. All materials are due by the third Friday in September for review by the Department Chair and Merit Committee Members.

ECED Merit Committee for Lecturers

1. Membership of the ECED Merit Committee for Lecturers

- a. Five faculty lecturers are elected for ECED Merit Committee membership. All lecturers are eligible to serve on the Merit Committee for a term of one academic year.

2. Election of Merit Committee Members

- a. Election for Merit Committee Members will be held at the May department meeting. Voting will be by confidential ballot.

3. Vacancies

- a. If a temporary vacancy is created on the Merit Committee, an election will be held at the next department meeting to fill the vacancy until the original member returns.

4. Chair of the Merit Committee

- a. Any committee member may be selected as chair by a majority vote of the committee.

5. Quorum

- a. All members of the committee must be present to vote on merit decisions.

6. Procedures

- a. Lecturers will submit their portfolios to be reviewed for merit to the department chair no later than the third Friday in September. Faculty merit review portfolios will include a Merit Request/Justification statement which indicates the specific level of merit the faculty member is requesting and a list of the past year's merit criteria that justify requested merit level.
- b. Merit Committee members will review the portfolios and Merit Requests of all lecturers before

their meeting to decide merit ratings. At the decision meeting, the committee will discuss the evaluations and attempt to reach consensus for each faculty member on a rating of not meritorious (COLA only), satisfactory (base merit), or excellent (base merit plus one performance merit).

- c. All deliberations of the Merit Committee are confidential.
- d. All voting is by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Merit committee chair. Since there are five members of the committee and all must be present, there will be no tie votes. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the voting results and the committee's recommendation to the next level of review and forward the confidential ballots to the Chair of the Department.
- e. The Merit Committee Chair will prepare a written report outlining the Level of Merit awarded, including vote count, and the justification for that level. The report shall reference the faculty member's teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, in relation to the department's standards and expectations and will be submitted to the department chairperson no later than the first Friday in February.

7. Materials for Merit Reviews

The Annual Report (AR) provides the framework to guide the individual lecturers in developing their merit evaluation portfolio. The portfolio shall include all materials required for the Annual Review and, in addition, a Merit Request/Justification Statement. All materials are due by the third Friday in September for review by the Department Chair and Merit Committee Members.

First Year Faculty

All first-year tenure-track faculty, in collaboration with the department chair, shall complete the form "Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty, (SENTF)" (see Section VII) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. The department chair shall append to the SENTF form the following materials:

- Board of Regents' and Towson University's criteria for annual review, reappointment, tenure, promotion, merit and comprehensive review considerations;
- standards and expectations of the university, college, and department; and
- any expectations unique to the position.

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review and reappointment rests with the faculty member.

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 his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review and reappointment contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally shall include:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- documentation of scholarship and service.
- peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

Reappointment: First Year Faculty

The department PTRM committee(s) shall evaluate each new faculty member's first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment and merit.

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,. 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.

The department PTRM committee shall review the evaluation portfolio and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the department PTRM document).

The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member and to the dean, inclusive of the department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The dean shall review the Evaluation Record and forward it to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall notify the department chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

Non-reappointment recommendations will be delivered to the Provost.

- A faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals section (Section V); however, an appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.
- If the Provost accepts the non-reappointment recommendation, written notice shall either be delivered to the faculty member or mailed to the faculty member's last known address by March 1; otherwise, the appointment is renewed automatically for one (1) additional year.

Timeline for First Year Review

The Third Friday in September

First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Second Friday in December

First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

The First Friday in January

The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

The Third Friday in January

The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.

Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

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.

Reappointment of Second Year Faculty

The department PTRM committee(s) shall evaluate second year tenure-track faculty and make a recommendation regarding reappointment.

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.

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. 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.

The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department chairperson should be forwarded by the department PTRM committee chairperson to the dean's office.

The dean shall review the Evaluation Record of second year faculty and forward it to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with a department recommendation, the dean shall notify the department chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

If the Provost accepts the non-reappointment recommendation, written notice shall either be delivered to the faculty member or mailed to the faculty member's last known address; otherwise, the appointment is renewed automatically for one (1) additional year.

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.

Timeline for Second Year Review

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

The Third Friday in September

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.

The Fourth Friday in October

Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. 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

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

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.

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.

Reappointment of Third through Fifth Year Faculty

The ECED department chair and the department PTRM committee will direct the recommendation on reappointment of third through fifth year faculty. The evaluation process shall include: the departmental PTRMs recommendation; the chair's recommendation, if any, the dean's recommendation, and, the Provost's final decision.

The faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment recommendation to the next highest level in the evaluation process; however, there shall be no appeal from the Provost's decision, which is final

The ECED procedures will be as follows:

1. All faculty dossiers must be submitted to the department by the date designated on the Permanent University Promotion and Tenure Calendar.
2. After each member of the reappointment/tenure committee has evaluated the faculty dossiers, giving particular attention to the correlation statements, the committee will meet to discuss their evaluations and vote. This will be done by written vote. These votes will be recorded and kept.
3. Recommendations regarding reappointment and tenure shall be recorded on the DRTR, University Promotion and Tenure Committee Departmental Recommendation Form, for each faculty member. The DRTR shall be signed by members of the appropriate committee and the faculty member concerned.
4. A copy of the Departmental Recommendation Form DRTR with supporting documents and materials shall be forwarded to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Timeline for Third through Fifth Year Review

Date	Task
Third Friday in June	Submit Evaluation Portfolio to Department Chair
August 1	Tenure-track faculty notified in writing of non-reappointment
Fourth Friday of October	ECED Chair's written Evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment.
Second Friday in November	Faculty Portfolio with Chair recommendation, PTRM Committee recommendation with record of vote count to be forwarded by Dept. PTRM Chair to Dean's office
November 30	All documentation for consideration process must be included in Portfolio
First Friday in February	Dean forwards all recommendations to Provost

Note: For further details see College PTRM document pages 34-35.

Third-Year Review

At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the department PTRM Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. Department PTRM committee evaluations of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost.

The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the department's PTRM committee.

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

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

- Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
- 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.
- 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.

All documentation is due to the chair of the department.

Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the department PTRM committee chair. The written report will be shared with the dean.

Documentation for Third Year Review

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review (includes annual review and third-year review) contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the

faculty member's college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- documentation of scholarship and service.

Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:

- all of the items listed above; and
 - peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.
- Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:
 - all of the items listed above;
 - syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
 - student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year; and
 - 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.

Timeline for Third Year Review

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

August 1 (USM mandated)

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or

subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.

The Third Friday in September

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. 35

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.

The Fourth Friday in October

Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

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

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

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 Third Friday in January

All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.

The First Friday in February

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.

First Friday in March

Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.

Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Review

The Department of Early Childhood Education follows the Comprehensive Five-Year Review procedures and chronology established by the University:

- a. The comprehensive review policies herein are in accordance with the principles established by the USM Board of Regents on 7/12/96 and shall not be construed to substitute for them.
- b. The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
- c. 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.
- d. The Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Education 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 Dean of the College.
- e. Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed in Section I B 3.d of the 2010 ART document
- f. The Department PTRM Committee(s) shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the Department's standards and expectations (stipulated in the Department PTRM document) and submitted to the Department Chair by the second Friday in October.
- g. 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.
- h. 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 Department PTRM Committee Chair to the Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
- i. The Dean of the College shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review by the first Friday in February. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.
- j. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section.
- k. 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. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

l. 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. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction or termination

n. Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.

o. Chairpersons, as faculty members, are included in the comprehensive review process.

p. Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" Department.

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for the comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.

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.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for comprehensive review contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents shall include:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms for each of the five years under review;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the five years under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, for the five years under review and including the following:
- student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;

- grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect Fall 2010;
- peer evaluations of teaching at least for the prior academic year;
- documentation of scholarship and service; and,
- a reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five years of his/ her work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or his/her chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson's or program director's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in September. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar.

If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director 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. The Dean will send a copy to the department chair of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

If the chairperson or program director 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. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form (see Section VII). A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

Copies of the chairperson's or program director's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

In addition to the annual evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for comprehensive review shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. Plastic sheet protectors are not to be used. In each section of the binder, documents will cover the five years under review and shall be presented from the most-to-least recent year. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:

Section I

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

Section II

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report (AR I & II) or Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR I & II) Forms.

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office.
- Include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- A minimum of two peer teaching evaluations shall be included from the five years under review.

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

- Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee;
- Letter of evaluation from department chairperson; and
- Letter of evaluation from academic dean.

Additional documentation responsibilities

- Binders that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the department.
- The dean of the college shall assure that the summative portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.
- The dean of the college shall have the responsibility of returning the supporting material to the department chair who shall then retain it for three years. The materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

Process and Procedures for Comprehensive Reviews

Principles

The evaluation materials included shall be professional, understandable, well-organized and easy to follow.

Recommendations shall be supported by referring to the faculty member's performance in the categories considered. Each proceeding level of evaluator(s) shall take into account the recommendations of the preceding evaluator(s). Evaluators at each level shall make an independent judgment, however, based on the evaluation material submitted at that level.

The evaluation process requires the exercise of sound judgment, confidential deliberation, and knowledge of the university, its educational vision, mission and goals.

All votes regarding comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

In the event of a negative recommendation at any level of review, the faculty member may choose to challenge the recommendation through the appeals process.

In the event of a difference in recommendations at the department level (PTRM committee and chair), the evaluation portfolio will be forwarded to the next level of review.

Documentation Development

For faculty evaluations, the full evaluation portfolio shall be assembled by the individual being considered for comprehensive review.

The faculty member about whom the recommendation is made shall review the evaluation portfolio at each level and indicate that all documents have been included at the time of the evaluation portfolio submission to the next level of review.

For every type of evaluation, 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.

In the event that a faculty member wishes to challenge any written administrator evaluation and/or committee recommendation, s/he may add to the file any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective of her/his performance.

All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material inclusion process has been adhered to with respect to notifying the faculty member and adhering to the review process timeline as stipulated in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar.

Document Storage

The department chairperson shall maintain a copy of all official documents concerning evaluation recommendations. Copies of all recommendations also shall be sent to the faculty member and the dean of the respective college.

The dean shall forward the evaluation recommendation to the Provost.

The official file concerning recommendations for five-year comprehensive review, shall be maintained by the Provost as Chief Academic Officer of the university.

Evaluation Procedures

Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

- The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
- 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 chair of the department, in consultation with the dean of the college 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 dean of the college.
- Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed above.
- The department PTRM committee(s) shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (stipulated in the department PTRM document) and submitted to the department chair.
- The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- 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 department PTRM committee chair to the dean's office.
- The dean of the college shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.
- A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section.
- 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. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

- 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. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair and dean.
- The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction or termination
- Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.
- Chairpersons, as faculty members, are included in the comprehensive review process.
- Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their “home” department.

Comprehensive Review Committee Structure, Policies, and Procedures

The department PTRM committee shall make recommendations concerning comprehensive five-year review.

The department chairperson shall not serve as a voting member of the department PTRM committees.

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.

There are three (3) types of appeals:

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either department and/or college PTRM committees, the department chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member’s performance.

The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the college PTRM, dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.

Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean and the college PTRM committee.

All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM committee chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the college PTRM committee, the university PTRM committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.

2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.

Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM committee.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the dean and the university PTRM committee chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean, the college PTRM committee, the department chair, and the university PTRM committee chair. Appeals of Provost recommendations shall be copied to the dean and department chair.

Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the university PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

Recommendations of the university PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the university PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-

01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

The President’s decision on comprehensive five-year review shall be final.

Faculty Development Relative to PTRM Process

Because the goal of the faculty evaluation process is to enhance student learning and to address the mission and vision of the university, college and/or department, the university shall maintain a foundation of resources to support the faculty in its evaluation role, both as individuals and the evaluation structure.

Resources shall be supported university-wide through the Division of Academic Affairs and through other appropriate units, such as the Center for Instructional Advancement and Technology (CIAT), as well as through departmental and college-based programs.

Within the second semester of the academic year, the Office of the Provost shall provide a workshop addressing PTRM issues. Faculty members serving on university, college, and/or department PTRM committees are expected to attend. Faculty members aspiring to serve on PTRM committees are encouraged and welcomed to attend regardless of their rank. Such workshops may address current national trends in evaluation issues and any changes in USM and Towson institutional policies. A certificate of attendance will be provided. Faculty may include such certificate under university service in their annual evaluation portfolio.

Timeline for Comprehensive Review

The Third Friday in June

Eligible faculty members submit their comprehensive review portfolio to the department chair for review in the fall.

All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review from March must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

The Third Friday in September

Final date for faculty to add information to update their comprehensive review portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.

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.

The Fourth Friday in October

Department chairperson’s written evaluation for faculty considered for comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

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 comprehensive review 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

All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the comprehensive review portfolio.

The First Friday in February

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 five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

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.

Amendment and Mandatory Review of the Department of Early Childhood Education Document

It is the intent that this committee will review and revise this document, as necessary, at the December Department meeting with evidence of such review being sent to the dean of the college and the University Promotion, Tenure, and Review Committee. Changes made at any time are passed with a simple majority by open vote of tenured/tenure-track faculty. The changed Departmental PTRM document, with Approval Form, is first submitted no later than the first Friday in December to the COE PTRM Committee and the Dean for approval. Excepting faculty who are on leave from the Department (e.g. medical, sabbatical), the signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member of ECED will signify that s/he has voted on the Department PTRM document. Such constitutes the Approval Form. Following approval by the College PTRM Committee and the Dean, the Department PTRM document shall be delivered by the Dean to the Chairperson of the University PTRM Committee by the second Friday in February. The Department PTRM Committee shall formally respond to changes and/or recommendations resulting from the review by the University PTRM Committee and submit a revised copy to the College PTRM Committee and the Dean of the College for approval prior to the due date specified by the University PTRM Committee. All policies at the Department/program level shall remain in effect until changed according to the procedures described herein. However, faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the Departmental PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they are first appointed to a tenure-track position.

The Chairperson of the Department is responsible for assuring that the approved Departmental PTRM documents are posted on the Towson University website.

Appendix A



College of Education
Department of Early Childhood Education

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION OF COLLEAGUE FORM

Name of Instructor Conducting Class _____

Course Number and Title _____

Date _____ Time _____ Length of Observation _____

Content _____

Name of Observer _____

Directions: Please indicate in paragraph form your evaluation of the instructor in each of the following areas. If the behavior is not observed or not appropriate for the mode of teaching, please indicate this in the space provided. After completing the evaluation arrange to meet with the instructor to discuss the observation. Give a copy of the observation to the instructor, and a copy to the Department Chair. (Please type the evaluation).

CLARITY OF PRESENTATION:

KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT:

RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS:

(Rapport w/students, sensitivity to students, openness to student questions, supportive of student contributions, ability to accept challenges, etc.)

DEMONSTRATES ENTHUSIASM ABOUT SUBJECT MATTER:

IMPLEMENTS A PLANNED/ORGANIZED PROCEDURE FOR INSTRUCTION:

MODELS VARIED TEACHING STRATEGIES:

(Stimulates interaction, actively engages students in learning, clarifies with examples, etc.)

SUMMARIZING COMMENTS:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

ECED ACADEMIC ADVISING EVALUATION FORM

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT CAREFULLY. Circle the response that most closely expresses your views in rating your advisor on the following basic components. The information that you provide is confidential and anonymous.

AFTER COMPLETING THIS FORM -- PLEASE FOLD IN HALF AND PLACE IN THE DROP-OFF BOX LOCATED IN THE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION OFFICE HAWKINS HALL ROOM 019.

Advisor's Name _____ Semester _____ Year _____

Strongly Disagree \longrightarrow Strongly Agree

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. My advisor was a good listener. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 2. My advisor was friendly and courteous with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 3. My advisor showed genuine interest in me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 4. My advisor encouraged me to ask questions and discuss my concerns. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 5. My advisor was knowledgeable about the ECED program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

Comments: _____

Appendix C

TOWSON UNIVERSITY PROMOTION, TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT CALENDAR

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

The first Friday in May

Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

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

August 1 (USM mandated)

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.

The First Friday in September

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

The Second Friday in September

University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee's Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.

The Third Friday in September

- A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- B. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).
- C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 35
- D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in September

Department chairperson notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

The Second Friday in October

- A. Department PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
- B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

The Fourth Friday in October

- A. Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
- B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- C. The department PTRM committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November

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

November 30th

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

The First Friday in December

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the 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.
- B. The college PTRM committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

- C. The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.
- D. All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.
- E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The First Friday in February

- A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.
- B. The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

- A. The dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.
- B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM committee.
- C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

March 1

First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the university President.

First Friday in March

Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.

Third Friday in March

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTRM committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.

Appendix D

ECED PTRM Committee Agreement

Department of Early Childhood Education

Promotion/Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee

I _____, by signing this document acknowledged that I have reviewed the pertinent files relevant to each candidate requesting Promotion/Tenure during the _____ academic year and I agree to keep all conversations confidential.

Faculty Signature

Date

Appendix E

Department of Early Childhood Education PTRM Committee Vote Sheet

College of Education

Promotion/Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee

_____ is requesting

Promotion

Tenure

From Rank: _____ **to** Rank: _____

I Support the Request for

Promotion

and/or

Promotion with Tenure

I Do Not Support the Request for Promotion and/or Promotion with Tenure

I Abstain (Requires documentation of Provost approval for abstention)

Towson University ID # _____

Date: _____

Appendix F
TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

P & T RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____
(Faculty Member)

This form is to be completed for all faculty holding a fulltime contract by each department upon the conclusion of its promotions and tenure process each fall. It is forwarded to the appropriate college/school Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committee for use during its deliberations. By signing this form faculty candidates indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendation(s); it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendation(s). Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendation(s) should follow procedures found in Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit in the Faculty Handbook.

The _____ Department PTRM Committee voted to recommend that you have:
 Tenure granted
 Tenure denied

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following:
Promotion to:
 Assistant Professor
 Associate Professor
 Professor
 No promotion

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following:
 No Merit
 Base Merit
 Base +Merit

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:
 Reappointed
 Not reappointed

Faculty Member Signature Date

Appendix G

Sample College PTRM Committee Promotion and/or Tenure Review Form

Name: _____

Department: _____

Rank- _____

Requesting Rank- _____

Review of Current Annual Report

Checklist √ Are Items Present and Complete?	Items Under Review	Comments
	<u>Current AR Form</u>	Include a Review of All Required AR Material
	Part I	
	Part II	
	CV	
	Student Course Evaluations	
	All Course Syllabi <i>Not Required in Provost Dossier</i>	
	Peer Observation <i>Not required in Provost Dossier</i>	

Appendix G (Continued)

Promotion and Tenure Dossier Review Sheet

Items Under Review	
Sections of Dossier	Comments
<p><i>Title Page</i> <i>Table of Contents</i></p>	
<p>Section I: <u>Executive Summary</u> A clear description of accomplishments in each facet of review (teaching, scholarship, and service).</p>	
<p>Section II <u>Faculty Annual Reports</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin with the most recent year and include each preceding year thereafter. • Clearly differentiate <i>Annual Report Part I and Part II</i>. 	
<p>Section III <u>Summary of Student Evaluations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly summaries of course evaluations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If quantitative in nature include in table format. • Yearly summaries of advising evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If quantitative in nature include in table format. 	
<p>Section IV <u>Scholarly Product</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of one recent publication or description of creative activity 	
<p>Section V <u>Curriculum Vita</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most recent 	
<p>Section VI <u>Written recommendations.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department PTRM Committee Chair • Department Chair including the DSR Form. 	

Appendix G (Continued)

Qualitative Review of Dossier

Areas of Review	Comments and Evaluation
<p>TEACHING</p> <p>Review candidates teaching including but not exclusive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Load • Course Development • Program Development • Advising (Including undergraduate and graduate) • PDS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Involvement? ○ Coordination? (Meaning primary responsibility for overall PDS implementation) • Quantitative and/or qualitative ratings of teaching and advising 	

Appendix G (Continued)

SCHOLARSHIP

- For Associate Professor, look for the development of a scholarly agenda with a progressing record of dissemination.
- For Professor look for the a scholarly agenda with a sustained record dissemination.

Presentations

Are these mostly in one arena or balanced across all? Does it matter?

- **International/National**
- **Regional**
- **State**
- **Local**
 - **School Workshops: PDS and/or non-PDS related.**

Publications

Review quantity and quality of contributions and potential impact on intended audience.

- Books
- Book Chapters
- Non-Refereed Journals
- Refereed Journals
- Other Journals
- Other contributions

Grants

Review quantity and quality.

- Submitted
- Funded

Appendix G (Continued)

<p>SERVICE</p> <p>➤ Include a description of membership and leadership positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• University• College• Department:• Discipline• Other• Mentoring Faculty	
<p>Additional Comments</p>	
<p>Reviewed Completed By:</p>	
<p>Date:</p>	