



TOWSON
UNIVERSITY

Department of Elementary Education

**PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT,
AND MERIT POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

Approved 11/30/15

Approved by UPTRM Committee 1/22/16

Table of Contents

Standards.....	3
Policies and	
Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment.....	3
Annual Review and Reappointment.....	5
Promotion to Associate Professor and Advance to Tenure.....	5
Promotion to Professor.....	6
Merit.....	7
Procedures.....	10
Annual Review.....	10
PTRM.....	11
PTR Committee.....	11
Materials for Faculty Evaluation (PTR).....	13
Merit Committee.....	14
Third Year.....	15
Five Year.....	16
Calendar.....	18
Appendices.....	21
Appendix A – Peer Evaluation Form	
Appendix B – Advising Evaluation Form	
Appendix C – Sample Scholarly Products and Activities	
Appendix D – ELED PTR Committee Ballot	
Appendix E – PTRM Committee Agreement	
Appendix F – Ballot Department Merit Recommendation	
Appendix G – Department Summary Merit Recommendation	
Appendix H – Department Summary Recommendation	



Department of Elementary Education

PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

NOTE: Additional details to the ELED PTRM document follow those outlined in ART and the COE PTRM document.

Standards

I. Standards for all faculty in the Department of Elementary Education:

- A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical and professional behavior.
- A faculty member is an effective teacher.
- A faculty member meets classes as scheduled and is available for advising and consultation through office hours.
- A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college and University.
- A faculty member is committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and is committed to continuing professional development and scholarly growth.
- A faculty member shares the responsibility of Towson University governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.

II. Standards for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR)

A. Areas of Review

1. 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.

Teaching performance will be evaluated from the following evidence submitted by the candidate:

- peer evaluations of all faculty, with a minimum of two observations/evaluations per review period. 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. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the comprehensive five-year review. Peer evaluations shall use the suggested department criteria found in Appendix A to report the findings.
- student evaluations of teaching (quantitative and qualitative responses from the Towson University evaluation system) for all courses taught. These evaluations shall be administered by the Towson University Assessment Office and shall ensure students' confidentiality.

- review of syllabi and other instructional materials
- self-evaluation of teaching/advising effectiveness in a narrative statement that discusses the faculty member’s teaching/advising philosophy and an interpretation of student/peer/chairperson’s evaluations.

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;
- Be professional in relating to students.
- Assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their professional goals; and
- 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.

Advising performance will be evaluated by department/university evaluations and student evaluations of advising (see Appendix B).

2. Scholarship

As in the College of Education PTRM document, the ELED Department has also adopted the UNISCOPE (2000) model as a guiding framework. This model defines scholarship 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)

The forms of scholarship that guide our work are:

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

Appendix C provides examples of evidence for each form of scholarship but the list is not inclusive of all products that faculty may use for the evaluation of scholarship.

3. Service

Faculty members are responsible for service to the Department, College, and University, their discipline, and the broader community including collaborations and partnerships with practitioners in the field. Service performance will be evaluated from evidence such as the following submitted by the candidate:

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

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.

B. Standards for Annual Review and Reappointment.

The standards for PTR will be used, including strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

C. Relationship Between Standards for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Standards for Merit

The department's standards for promotion apply to faculty members' teaching, scholarship, and service over a number of years and the standards for merit review apply to faculty members' performances in these areas for one year.

D. Standards for promotion to Associate Professor and 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 as well as evidence of service, ELED Department support for tenure and promotion will not be granted.

1. Teaching

ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and advancement to tenure will demonstrate excellence in teaching as documented by:

- Peer evaluations
- Student evaluations of teaching (quantitative and qualitative responses)
- Review of syllabi and other instructional materials
- Student evaluations of advising

2. **Scholarship**

ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and advancement to tenure will demonstrate evidence in scholarship as documented by:

- Evidence of a focused scholarly agenda
- A sustained record of quality scholarship, including but not limited to, peer-reviewed conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications/successful grants
- Other evidence as documented on the chart in Appendix C

3. **Service**

ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and advancement to tenure will demonstrate evidence in service as documented by a sustained record of quality service to the university, college, department, community, and/or profession.

E. **Standards for promotion to Professor**

1. **Teaching**

In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate Professor, ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Professor will demonstrate excellence in teaching as documented by activities such as:

- Mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in teaching and advising
- Taking a leadership role in updating, and/or developing courses and curriculum
- Directing accreditation and /or program approval efforts

2. **Scholarship**

In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate Professor, ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Professor will demonstrate excellence in scholarship as documented by activities such as:

- Evidence of local, regional, national, and/or international expertise/reputation
- Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues in their scholarly activity

3. **Service**

In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate Professor, ELED faculty pursuing promotion to the rank of Professor will demonstrate excellence in service as documented by activities such as:

- Leadership in service to the department, college, and/or university
- Leadership to the profession

F. Standards for merit

It is the responsibility of faculty 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 (No Merit):

Faculty whose performance fails to adequately meet even satisfactory standards in one or more of the following areas—teaching, scholarship, service. This includes faculty who do not meet the standards and expectations listed in this document and/or do not meet expectations in the accomplishment of the activities stated in the previous year's AR II document and activities accomplished and reported in the AR I document. The department Promotion, Review, and Merit (PRM) committee will recommend only the cost of living allowance (COLA) for the non-meritorious faculty member, and direct the faculty member's Rank Committee and Department Chair to guide the faculty member in a specific plan for professional growth.

Satisfactory (Base Merit):

Faculty who abide by the written policies and standards of the Department, College, and University, contribute to the mission of the university, and exhibit satisfactory performance in teaching, scholarship, *and* service in light of expectations set in the previous year's AR II document and performance reported in the AR I document will receive base merit. Satisfactory performance is exhibited through one or more of the following in each area:

1. Teaching

Faculty will document *satisfactory* teaching in a self-evaluation statement in which they discuss all of the following evidence (if applicable):

- peer evaluations (if applicable that academic year)
- student evaluations of teaching
 - quantitative means on the summary sheet for each course generally rated 3.5 – 3.9
 - generally positive and supportive qualitative responses
- review of syllabi and other instructional materials
- positive student evaluations of advising (if applicable that academic year)
- grade distributions for each course taught
- new and effective instructional procedures and/or courses reported on AR I.
- the faculty member's correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I.

2. Scholarship

Scholarship activities - submitting a paper for publication *and* also the following (not inclusive), will be considered evidence of *satisfactory* performance:

- submitted a proposal to present at a conference
- submitted a proposal for a grant or award to an internal/external agency
- 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

- revised professional work
- 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 ELED, COE, or University program
- Submitting professional work to a colleague for critique
- Publication of non peer-reviewed work, such as newsletters, book reviews, websites, etc.
- Other –as approved by the Merit Committee

3. Service

- served actively on departmental, college, university or community committees
- served actively in an advisory group that advanced the mission of Towson University
- chaired a committee within a PDS
- served actively on the School Improvement Team for a PDS
- engaged students in a significant service learning project
- volunteered to perform tasks, as requested by the Chair or Departmental committee, needed to improve or continue the Departmental programs
- presented at a local or state level professional conference
- demonstrated professional competence in consulting activities

Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit):

Faculty who are deemed excellent in *teaching* and excellent in either scholarship or service, with a satisfactory ranking in the third area in light of expectations set in the previous year's AR II document and performance reported in the AR I document will receive base plus merit. An exception to this two-areas *excellent*- and-one-area-*satisfactory* rule can be made, if the Merit Committee deems the quantity and quality of the faculty member's scholarship and service work, although composed of *satisfactory* category activities, warrants an *excellent* rating. The *satisfactory* categories, however, must be in scholarship and service; teaching must be *excellent* for any merit.

1. Teaching

Faculty will document *excellence* in teaching in a self-evaluation statement in which they discuss all of the following evidence (if applicable):

- peer evaluations (if applicable that academic year)
- student evaluations of teaching
 - quantitative means on the summary sheet for each course generally in the range of 4.0 – 5.0
 - predominately positive and supportive qualitative responses
- review of syllabi and other instructional materials for each course taught
- excellent student evaluations of advising (if applicable that academic year)
- grade distributions for each course taught

- new and effective instructional procedures and/or courses reported on AR I.
- the faculty member's correlation statement for teaching reported on AR I.
- overseeing the development of a new cohort or PDS relationship
- designing / providing materials for adjunct faculty
- mentoring junior faculty and adjuncts in teaching and/or advising
- other (Evidence of advanced performance in teaching-related activities)

2. **Scholarship**

Faculty submitted a paper for publication *and* also (not inclusive) showed evidence of 2 or more of the following:

- 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
- 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 (Evidence of advanced performance in scholarship)—as approved by the Merit Committee

3. **Service**

- 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
- 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 junior faculty in service
- other (evidence of advanced performance in service)

Standards for Merit for Lecturers

All full-time lecturers in the Elementary Education Department are eligible for department merit if appropriate materials are submitted and performance is judged meritorious (i.e., exceeds the departmental expectations). We request that Lecturers go through this review and feedback process although funding for merit increases may be unavailable.

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:

A. Not Meritorious – Lecturers who have not met departmental expectations and/or were not rated satisfactory in teaching.

B. Satisfactory (Base Merit) – Lecturers who have met departmental expectations and are rated satisfactory in teaching.

C. 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.

Policies and Procedures

Annual Review

All faculty, tenured and tenure-track, shall be evaluated annually by the department chair according to the procedures and criteria described above. Faculty shall complete the current version of the Annual Report (AR) and Workload Agreement and include it in their evaluation portfolio and meet with the department chair by the third Friday in June.

Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio and 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, including:
 - i. student evaluations of teaching and advising tabulated by the Towson University Assessment Office or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - ii. grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
 - iii. peer observation evaluation report (for pre-tenure faculty and others as appropriate)
- e. documentation of scholarship and service.
- f. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit

As allowed by the TU ART document (Appendix 3, p. 3-30) the elementary education department has two committees for the PTRM process.

1. The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee mentors new faculty in the tenure and promotion process and administers the system of faculty evaluation as designated by the ELED 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.

Special Charge: Due to the diversity of ELED programs and the great differences in ELED faculty responsibilities, both the Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment and Merit Committees are given the charge to examine individual faculty in light of his/her unique roles and responsibilities.

I. ELED Promotion and Tenure/Reappointment Committee (PTR)

A. Membership of the ELED Promotion and Tenure/Reappointment Committee (PTR)

- a. The **Tenure Committee** for the Department of Elementary 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 Elementary 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 sit 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.

B. Chair of the Tenure and Promotion/Reappointment (PTR) Committee:

- a. The chair of the ELED PTR committee is a tenured member of the department and does not serve concurrently on the College PTR Committee.
- b. The chair of the ELED 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's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of committee's and department chairperson's evaluations, to the Dean's office by the second Friday of November.
- C.** 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.
- D.** A faculty member under consideration for promotion is ineligible to participate in the committee's deliberations in regard to his/her own dossier.
- E. Committee Policies, Duties, and Procedures**
- a. The ELED 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 ELED 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 D).
- j. Minutes of all meetings and votes will be kept by the chair of the committee and filed in the ELED office.
 - k. All deliberations are confidential. (see Appendix E)
 - l. All decisions and explanatory statements will be shared with the faculty candidate in a conference with the ELED 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.

F. Materials for Faculty Evaluation (PTR)

Materials for faculty evaluation (PTR) are the responsibility of the candidate. The faculty candidate shall submit two dossiers simultaneously:

1. A summative dossier which meets the requirements set for eventual submission to the Provost. This one inch binder includes:

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 Forms I & II arranged from most recent to the time of the last promotion or year of hire

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty should submit the summary of results from 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
- For tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review, peer teaching evaluations shall be included.

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

- Recommendation letters from the department, department chair, college committee, and dean

2. A lengthier, supportive dossier that provides specific evidence (i.e., syllabi, scholarly products, documentation of service, etc.) of the candidate's credentials.

G. Committee Operating Standards

- a. The Committee will follow the specific standards and criteria for evaluation set forth by the ELED department, the College of Education, and Towson University.
- b. The Department calendar will comply with the University Promotion and Tenure calendar and as outlined in of the College of Education Document.

II. ELED Merit Committee

A. Membership of the ELED Merit Committee

- a. Four faculty (three members and one alternate) are elected for ELED 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.
 - vi. In a year where there is no faculty at a particular rank an at large member of the committee will be elected.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. Chair of the Merit Committee

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

E. Quorum

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

F. 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.

- b. 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).
- c. All deliberations of the Merit Committee are confidential. (see Appendix E)
- 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 (see Appendix F). 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.
- 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 second Friday in October.
- f. The department chair may prepare an independent recommendation and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. The Merit Committee will follow the University PTRM calendar.
- j. 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.

G. 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.

III. Other ELED Department Policies and Procedures

A. Third Year Review

The ELED Department will conduct reviews of faculty at the conclusion of the fall semester of their third year to assess their progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. Department PTR committee evaluations will become

part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the dean but will not be forwarded to either the college PTR committee or the Provost.

The faculty member under review shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio in a three-ring binder and submit it to the department chair by the third Friday of January. The portfolio shall include:

- **Completed and signed AR Parts I and II**
- **Current Curriculum Vita**
- **Syllabi of courses taught during the previous two years and fall semester of current year**
- **Evaluation of teaching and advising for the previous two years and fall semester of the current year, including**
 - Student evaluations of teaching and advising (If quantitative, in table format)
 - Grade distributions for courses taught
 - Peer Observation Letters
- **Documentation of scholarship and service**
- **A narrative statement** in which the faculty member describes how he/she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

The department PTR committee will evaluate the materials and provide a written statement of the faculty member's progress toward tenure in relation to teaching/advising, scholarship, service, and any other relevant criteria. Progress will be evaluated as superior, satisfactory, or not satisfactory. The written evaluation will be shared with the faculty member in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the chair of the PTR committee no later than the first Friday in March.

B. Vote on Approval of Document

This document may be amended at any time, but will be reviewed and revised as necessary, every three years. A simple majority of the votes cast by confidential ballot will constitute agreement. The signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the department will signify that s/he has voted on the department PTRM document. In the case of a tie vote, the committee will continue deliberations and vote again until a majority decision is reached. Changes will be submitted to the College of Education PTRM Committee and the Dean for approval before going to the University Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee for approval.

C. Voting Privileges of Faculty on Sabbatical/Leave

Faculty members on sabbatical or other leave will be eligible to participate in deliberations and vote if they review the materials under consideration.

D. Comprehensive Five-Year Review

All ELED tenured faculty members shall participate in a comprehensive review at least once every five years. The review is summative for a period of the preceding five academic years.

Evaluation portfolio materials shall be organized in a three-ring binder in the following manner:

Section I

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

Section II

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report Forms I & II arranged from most recent to the last time of review

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty should submit the summary of results from each course received from the assessment office.
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations
- A minimum of two peer teaching evaluations

Section IV

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

Section V

- Recommendations from the ELED Comprehensive Review Committee, Department Chairperson, and CoE Dean

The department PTR committee shall review the evaluation portfolio and vote. 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. The committee chair shall prepare a written report, including the vote count and the committee's recommendation, and forward it to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall be forwarded to the Provost.

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.

IV. Calendar

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

The first Friday in May

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

The Third Friday in June

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

A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chairperson and dean.

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

August 1 (USM mandated)

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

The First Friday in September

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

The Second Friday in September

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

The Third Friday in September

A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

B. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).

C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 3-35

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. 3-37

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.

Notes:

- Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their “home” department.
- The deadline for the revision of this document is 12/7/15.

Appendix A

Peer Evaluation Criteria

ELED Department Peer Observation/Evaluation of Teaching

The completed observation report includes:

1. Brief description of class observed

- a. Students (level, ages, number, gender, etc.)
- b. Overview of subject, topic, focus of class session

2. Categories of observation, evaluation (see below)

Course/Class Content and Processes

Content, processes appropriate for course, class objectives
Instructor depth, accuracy of knowledge

Instruction

Clearly stated purpose, objectives of lesson
Multiple, appropriate methods of instruction
Clear, organized instruction
Student-centered instruction

Classroom Atmosphere, Dynamics

Instructor enthusiasm
Rapport with students
Professional behavior, communication

3. Summary and conclusions, recommendations for improvement

NOTE: Submit a completed and signed report to both the faculty member observed and the department chair. Completed report must be submitted within three weeks of the observation.

Appendix B

Advising Evaluation Form: Elementary Education Department

Advisor's Name: _____

Date: _____

Check your best response to the following three questions:

1. Applying for Level I Level III

2. I have contacted my advisor _____ times since beginning my program.

*** Contact means email, phone calls, in person, or a note left in the advisor's mailbox.**

0 1 2 3 4 5 More than
Times Time Times Times Times Times 5 Times

3. I primarily interact with my advisor through: (Select One)

**In Person
Meetings**

Email

**Telephone Calls
And/or phone Messages**

	Never 1	Rarely 2	Occasionally 3	Frequently 4	Always 5	Not Applicable NA
1. My advisor is available by appointment.						
2. If I am unable to see my advisor during my advisor's posted office hours, my advisor assists me outside of those posted hours (usually within 48-72 hours except for holidays, weekends, or other circumstances by email, phone class, in person, or scheduled office visits).						
3. My advisor gives me as much time as I need to address my questions and concerns.						
4. My advisor informs me of University, College, and/or Department academic policies and procedures (example: The Gen Eds. Program Requirements)						
5. My advisor responds to my questions in a timely manner (usually within 48-72 hours except for holidays, weekends, or other circumstances).						
6. My advisor is a valuable resource						
7. My advisor cares for my professional and personal well-being.						

Appendix B (continued)

Written Responses

1. I think my advisor's strengths are ...

2. I have the following suggestions to improve my advisor's performance.

3. Other comments.

Appendix C:

Sample Scholarly Products and Activities

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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to committees or groups • Workshops for schools and community groups • Accreditation report • Syllabus for a new course • Syllabi for a new program • 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)
<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 	<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 • New course/program development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials/Publications designed to reach an audience of practitioners, parents, students, or other members of the community • Syllabus for a new course • Syllabi for a new program • 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.

Appendix D
ELED PTR Committee Ballot

College of Education

Promotion/Tenure and Reappointment Committee

_____ is requesting

Promotion

Tenure

Comprehensive Five Year Review

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

I Support the Request for

Promotion
and/or

Comprehensive Five Year Review

Promotion with Tenure

I Do Not Support the Request

I Abstain (Requires documentation of Provost approval for abstention)

Towson University ID # _____

Date: _____

Appendix E

PTRM Committee Agreement

Department of Elementary 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/Merit during the _____ academic year
and I agree to keep all conversations confidential.

Faculty Signature

Date

BALLOT

DEPARTMENT MERIT RECOMMENDATION

Based on Evaluation of Activities for Academic Year

June 1, 20____ to May 31, 20____

Faculty member being evaluated _____ Rank _____

Department of Elementary Education

Faculty member casting this ballot: ID# _____ Date _____

Check one level of merit under each category.

	Teaching/Advising	Service	Scholarship*
Not Meritorious			
Satisfactory (Base)			
Excellent (Base +1)			

*As defined in the *Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (VI.B.2.a)*:
 “research, scholarship, and in appropriate areas, creative activities.”

OVERALL MERIT RECOMMENDATION (check only one):

Not Meritorious	
Satisfactory (Base)	
Excellent (Base +1)	

This is a confidential ballot as directed by the

Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty

(Appendix 3: III.A.5)

Appendix G

DEPARTMENT SUMMARY MERIT RECOMMENDATION

Based on Evaluation of Activities for Academic Year June 1, 20____ to May 31, 20____

Faculty member evaluated: _____ Rank _____

Department of Elementary Education

Signature Dept. Merit Committee Chair: _____ Date _____

Department Merit Committee Total Votes

	Teaching/Advising	Service	Scholarship*
Not Meritorious			
Satisfactory (Base)			
Excellent (Base +1)			

OVERALL MERIT RECOMMENDATION (check only one):

Not Meritorious	
Satisfactory (Base)	
Excellent (Base +1)	

Signatures of voting merit committee members (use backside if necessary):

**Appendix H - TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)**

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

P & T RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____

(Faculty Member)

This form is to be completed for all tenure track and clinical faculty by each department upon the conclusion of its PTRM process each fall. When promotion or tenure is being considered, it is forwarded as part of the faculty member's file to the appropriate college promotion and tenure committee for use during its deliberations. Recommendations on merit, reappointment, and five year comprehensive reviews are to be forwarded directly from the department to the dean of the college. By signing this form faculty members indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendation(s); their signatures do not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendation(s). Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendation(s) should follow procedures found in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty.

The ELED Department PTRM Committee voted to recommend that you have:

- Tenure granted
- Tenure denied

The ELED Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following:

- Promotion to:
- Associate Professor
 - Professor
 - No promotion

The ELED Department Merit Committee recommends you for the following:

- No Merit
- Base Merit
- Base +Merit

The ELED Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:

- Reappointed
- Not reappointed

The ELED Department PTRM Committee recommends that your performance for the period covered by the Five Year Comprehensive Review be judged:

- Satisfactory
- Less than Satisfactory

ELED Committee Chair Signature

Date

Faculty Member Signature

Date

Appendix I
TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY 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 Elementary Education Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:

- Reappointed
- Not reappointed

Vote count:

Faculty Member Signature Date

P&T Committee Chair Signature Date

Department Chair Signature Date