

**Towson University
College of Fine Arts and Communications
Department of Music**

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, WORKLOAD, AND MERIT
FOR
FULL-TIME TENURE TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY**

For Deliberations Beginning August 2019

Approved by the Music Faculty [December 4, 2018]

Approved by the COFAC PTRM committee [December 14, 2018]

Approved by the COFAC Dean [December 14, 2018]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Specific page numbers will need to be updated after finale editing.

I. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE	3
II. REVISION.....	3
III. PURPOSE.....	3
IV. UNIQUE PROFILES FOR INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS.....	4
V. UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS.....	4
VI. DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS.....	4
VII. MATERIAL FOR FACULTY EVALUATION.....	8
VIII. DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC PTRM COMMITTEE.....	19
IX. REAPPOINTMENT.....	21
X. MERIT.....	21
XI. PROMOTION.....	24
XII. COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY.....	24
XIII. REBUTTALS AND APPEALS.....	25
XIV. REFERENCE SOURCES.....	25
APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MUSIC DEPARTMENT FACULTY IN PREPARATION OF EVALUATION PORTFOLIOS.....	26
APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR PTRM LETTERS.....	30
APPENDIX C: CHECKLISTS.....	32
APPENDIX D: PEER OBSERVATION TEMPLATE.....	42
APPENDIX E: PTRM LETTER TEMPLATE.....	43
APPENDIX F: MERIT LETTER TEMPLATE.....	44
APPENDIX G: CALENDAR OF DEPARTMENTAL PTRM DEADLINES.....	45

**Towson University
College of Fine Arts and Communications
Department of Music**

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, WORKLOAD, AND MERIT
FOR FULL-TIME TENURE TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY**

I. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

No policies in this document may contradict or conflict with those of the University of Maryland System Board of Regents, the American Association of University Professors, Towson University, and the College of Fine Arts and Communication. The *University of Maryland System Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty* is found in the *Towson University Dean's/Chairperson's Handbook*. University policy is documented in the TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK AND TENURE OF FACULTY (hereafter referred to as "ART Document" or "ART").
<https://inside.towson.edu/generalcampus/tupolicies/documents/02-01.00%20Towson%20University%20Policy%20on%20Appointment,%20Rank%20and%20Tenure%20of%20Faculty.pdf>

The Chair of the Department of Music is responsible for assuring that this document is posted on the Towson University website.

II. REVISION

The department document pertaining to standards, criteria and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the department PTRM Committee and submitted to all tenured/tenure track department faculty for approval by a simple majority vote. This document will be reviewed every three (3) years and submitted with evidence of such review to the Dean of the college and the university PTRM Committee.

Any changes to this document must be approved by a simple majority vote of the Department of Music tenured and tenure/tenure-track faculty and submitted to the college PTRM Committee by the first Friday in December if any changes have been made. Substantive changes in criteria, but not procedure, must be approved by the University Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee.

All policies at the department 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.

III. PURPOSE

- To exercise peer review in the articulation and evaluation of faculty performance.
- To establish standards by which faculty performance can be measured.

- To assist faculty in their continuing efforts to develop excellence in teaching and professional pursuits.
- To elicit evaluative responses from colleagues and students with regard to faculty performance.
- To obtain recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit for each tenured and tenure-track member of the faculty.
- To articulate faculty responsibilities.

IV. UNIQUE PROFILES FOR INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS

Each faculty member will be evaluated as a unique individual exhibiting a distinctive profile of accomplishment in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The profile will depend upon the nature of a faculty member's specialization within the discipline of music and personal interests but must also reflect the department's needs and teaching responsibilities. Creative activities are considered to be scholarship.

The Department of Music recognizes the University's policy that 8 units (1 unit = one three-credit course or its equivalent) represent a load expected of all faculty per academic year. Full-time faculty in the Department of Music calculate their workload, which consists of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service, administration, and other assignments, in 3-credit course load measures or its equivalent. A 3-credit course equals 3 load credits or one unit as defined above. A one-hour private lesson equals 0.67 load credits. A full-time position must account for twenty-four (24) credits or 8 units each year. Justification of the teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service load is contained in the AR/CAR parts I and II for each year.

The Department of Music values working cultures of diversity expressed in the perspectives, values, and approaches each individual faculty member brings to teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. As such, PTRM evaluation of each colleague's participation in the diverse cultures of the department is understood in the context of cohesion and also diversity, and difference.

V. UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS

The TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK AND TENURE OF FACULTY [ART] can be accessed at the following web address:
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>

VI. DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS

The approved UPTRM Department PTRM Policy can be accessed at the following web address:
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>

For information regarding Criteria for Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review see ART Appendix 3: II.A-C.

Appendix A of this document describes standards and expectations which faculty members in the Department of Music may use to develop a unique profile and to support requests for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

These criteria are neither exclusive nor obligatory. They are intended to serve as a basis for determining the kinds of activity and levels of professional distinction and accomplishment that are expected for advancement through the process of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

A. General

In addition to the University, College and Departmental Standards and Expectations found in ART Appendix 3: II.B.1-3, the following expectations pertain to all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of Music:

- A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of human, ethical, and professional behavior.
- While collegiality can be a part of peer review, PTRM discussions, votes, and letters should be careful to refrain from personal evaluation and criticisms that cannot be supported with evidence and at a level that is expected for determination of employment, merit, promotion, and tenure.
- A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college, and university.
- Faculty should focus on the balance of quality in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.
- The PTRM committee is charged with evaluating the quality of each colleague's work and not simply reiterating what is reported in the AR I and AR II forms. This requires careful review of every dossier by each committee member. The Department of Music PTRM committee uses an honor system for that process.
- It is important to make use of standardized terms that describe faculty accomplishments accurately and uniformly. Some examples of standardized terms are: good, excellent, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, is satisfactory, is not satisfactory, is local, regional, national, or international.
- Evaluative statements in AR/CAR forms, narratives and Committee letters should judge contributions in terms of quantity and quality. Committee deliberations and evaluations are to focus on the accomplishment of work expectations articulated in a faculty member's individual ARI and ARII forms for the review period.

B. Teaching

(See also ART Appendix 3:II.C.1-2)

- The Department of Music follows the university's student evaluation procedures.
- Faculty members should be concerned with excellence in teaching. They should demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively and to promote student mastery of skills, concepts, and materials.
- Faculty members are responsible for preparing a syllabus for each of their teaching assignments in accordance with the TU current catalog course description, policies of Towson University, and academic freedom.
- The syllabus must state the general and specific course objectives, forms of evaluation, and standards expected, and reflect approved syllabus best practices found at: https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/documents/syllabus_guidelines_best_practices_4-18-16upload.pdf&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwjfncmAgMjeAhUE11MKHU4hBtAQFggEMAA&client=internal-uds-cse&cx=005253052272869529049:5m5ztf8h8s&usg=AOvVaw1br2SqzYmPRnQnysfTHsmE
- Faculty members are responsible for choosing and ordering texts and other materials appropriate to their teaching assignments.

- Faculty are obligated to evaluate students fairly, equitably, and in a manner appropriate to the course and its objectives, and to adhere to University evaluation and grading policies. Grading procedures should be clearly explained in syllabi. Faculty must respect student rights against improper academic evaluation and must assign academic evaluations without prejudice or bias. Students should be sufficiently assessed that they may know the level of their achievement before the University deadline to withdraw from a course.
- Faculty will meet classes and private students regularly as scheduled. Emergencies or illness must be reported to the music office as soon as possible so that students can be notified. All other absences must be approved in advance using the *Absence from Assignment* form. Ordinarily the instructor is responsible for seeing that all classes and students are cared for either with a substitute teacher, a make-up lesson, or another suitable solution.
- Faculty members who teach applied lessons are expected to arrange their lesson schedules in advance of each semester whenever possible and definitely before the end of the first week of each semester.
- Lessons missed due to faculty absence or due to excused student absence should be made up before the beginning of exam week.
- By the end of the second week of classes each semester, faculty members will provide a copy of their schedule to the Department Office. Faculty members should be available to students by appointment, telephone, and/or e-mail.
- Faculty will serve on end-of-semester juries, entrance auditions, other examinations, and/or degree recitals as appropriate to their teaching assignments.
- Faculty are expected to study and renew or modify approaches regularly and be willing to consider suggestions to improve their teaching.

ADVISING

- Faculty, recognizing that it is the student's responsibility to seek advising, will provide conscientious individual advising to students who are assigned to them. The department currently assigns music majors and minors to designated advisors.
- A form developed by the Advising Committee will assist us in improving our advising process so your constructive thoughts will be most useful.
- The information contained in the advising assessment forms will be viewed by Department of Music Advising Committee members and the Department Chairperson only. Forms themselves will be downloaded and retained in the Chair's files. Raw data obtained will not be sent out of the department. However, summaries of it may be used for five-year review, and/or promotion and tenure letters that do leave the department.
The primary purpose of the form is to assist the Department of Music in making its advising process thorough, timely, and useful to our students.

C. Scholarship and Creative Activity

(See also ART Appendix 3:II.C.3)

- Faculty are expected to commit to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty. This commitment includes awareness of recent scholarship, pursuit of continued personal scholarly growth, and attendance at professional meetings.
- Faculty will engage in scholarly and/or creative activities such as, but not limited to, publication, conference presentation, creation of original music compositions, musical knowledge, and/or tools for making or exploring music, course development and/or development of teaching beyond routine course maintenance, performance, production, and/or public presentation of music.

- Faculty will respect the scholarly/creative activities of Towson University faculty and students.

D. Service

(See also ART Appendix 3:II.C.4)

- A faculty member serves on departmental, college and/or university committees as well as professional organizations, and participates in department and division meetings.
- A faculty member shares the responsibility of university governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.
- A faculty member honors departmental and university deadlines and submits reports and other work in a timely fashion.
- A faculty member is available for departmental meetings three business days prior to the start of fall and spring semesters.
- Absences from required service obligations must be approved in advance using the *Absence from Assignment* form.
- A faculty member is engaged in Departmental citizenship, which is reflected, in part, by supporting and/or attending the scholarly/creative endeavors of our students and faculty except when on sabbatical or other approved leave. Other means of engagement can also be demonstrated. As such, faculty will articulate their engagement in AR 1 under service to the Department.
- A faculty member is committed to fostering and promoting the mission and strategic priorities of the Department of Music as part of their departmental service which includes, but is not limited to, demonstrated recruitment efforts, serving at incoming audition days, being involved in department-wide and/or area specific recruitment activities, demonstrated promotion of the Department of Music to the community, and/or other service related activities at the departmental, college and University levels that help to promote the Department.

E. Leadership

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

F. Appropriate Terminal Degree

To be eligible for promotion and tenure, faculty must possess an appropriate terminal degree, normally the doctorate. When the particular situation merits, there are two procedures by which an academic degree other than the earned doctorate will be accepted as an appropriate terminal degree and provide all rights and privileges of the doctorate:

1. Faculty with Distinguished Professional Experience

Designation for extraordinary status under the policy “Qualifications and Procedures for Promoting to Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor Extraordinary Faculty Who Do Not Hold a Terminal Degree” is found in the *Towson University Faculty Handbook*, Chapter 4.

2. Appointment of New Faculty

In some cases, the best applicants for positions in applied areas may only possess the Master of Music Degree. These positions may be advertised as “Master of Music Degree required, Doctorate preferred.” If the department chooses to interview an applicant who possesses only the Master’s Degree, the department may decide, based on the applicant’s outstanding artistic training, professional experience, and career accomplishment, to offer that applicant a contract in which the Master’s Degree is noted as the terminal degree with all the rights and privileges of those who hold an earned doctorate. Conversely, the department reserves the right, when hiring applicants who hold only the Master’s Degree and who do not meet the equivalent standards of a Doctorate, to require that the applicant earn the Doctorate before tenure is granted.

VII. MATERIAL FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. Department of Music Policies and Procedures:

Purpose of Review. The department recognizes that each faculty member offers a unique combination of education, skills, interests, experiences and career aspirations. Consequently, while the standards for performance will be consistent among faculty, the areas in which each faculty member is evaluated and the weight assigned to each of those areas will differ among faculty, consistent with the annual workload agreements as agreed to by the faculty member, Chair, and Dean.

1. Teaching: (in all its components including advising and mentoring): Student learning is at the core of Towson’s mission and the primary commitment of the faculty of the department. The teaching dimension of performance includes: Advising assigned and unassigned students from the department’s major fields of study, counseling students enrolled in the faculty member’s courses, classroom or online instruction, mentoring graduate and undergraduate research, preparation, and keeping current in the subject areas being taught, and evaluation of student performance. Teaching may also include supervision of student internships and directed or independent studies. It is acknowledged that approaches and outcomes may differ among disciplines and it is for the discipline and department to determine standards within the framework of the ART Document. While faculty play a critical role in student learning, this policy re-affirms the primary responsibility of the student for the student’s own learning outcomes and career preparation.
2. Scholarship: Scholarship involves the investigation of the significance and meaning of knowledge, undertaken through critical analysis and interpretation. Scholarship may be applied, where knowledge is applied to real world problems to gain an understanding of how the knowledge can be used to help individuals and institutions resolve such problems. Scholarship may also be that of discovery, where new knowledge is developed through rigorous and disciplined investigative efforts. Scholarship may also be considered that of original creative work. Scholarship typically includes both a process of peer review and some form of dissemination (or “publication”) of the work as determined by the relevant academic discipline. The following are possible ways in which scholarship can be pursued and included as part of the annual workload agreement: presentations made at practitioner conferences and events; creative works (art, dance, music, showings, works and so on); presentations made at scholarly conferences, with or without proceedings publication; publication of a refereed article, case, monograph, book chapter or book; publication of textbook supplements or other course materials; award of a research grant or fellowship; creation of licensed computer software; reviews of books, software, etc. in a refereed scholarly journal; awards from the department, college, university or professional association for scholarly activity; and others. Many fields demonstrate "publication" through creative production rather than through traditional written documents." For example,

"appropriate kinds of scholarship/creative activity" may include: productions, juried exhibitions, distribution, management (of media stations or labs), internet publication, and multi-media performance as well as film, video and digital media productions. Additionally, the department may determine that a grant proposal (and the successful attainment of a grant) may be either scholarship or service depending upon its assessment of the purpose and quality of the grant.

3. **Service:** Faculty are expected to contribute their professional expertise to the department, college, university, and professional associations. They are encouraged, but not required, to contribute to their communities as well. It is desirable that faculty service work, both at Towson and in professional associations, begins with membership and active participation on committees and eventually progress to leadership roles. Assessment will consider the level and extent of participation and contribution to service endeavors (rather than mere membership) and the collegiality displayed in treating others in a respectful manner. In presenting their service for review, faculty members should prepare a narrative, which explains the scope and depth of their contributions and may also solicit letters of support, or references, from those under whom the service was engaged.

B. 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 A.R.T. III-2-C) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. The Department Chair shall append to the SENTF form the following materials:

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

(Please consult the ART document for further information)

C. Format for Evaluation Portfolios

All faculty shall complete the current version of the Annual Report (AR/CAR) and Workload Agreement and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member. Evaluation portfolios must remain housed in the Department of Music storage location except where articulated by normal university procedures. Portfolios may be briefly removed within the department when faculty undertake updates and/or committee members peruse files; however, portfolios should be returned and stored overnight.

- It is the responsibility of the individual to present an evaluation portfolio in the required format and to see that all required materials are present. Each year the Department Chair and Promotion, Tenure, Rank, Merit [PTRM] Committee Chair(s) will update evaluation portfolio content checklists (Appendix C) to conform to instructions from the Provost.
- Normally, in the spring semester of even numbered years, a peer observation of each tenured faculty member will be scheduled. For tenured faculty undergoing five-year review, two observations spread apart across a minimum of four semesters are required for the dossier.
- For all faculty, evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder and include documentation of scholarship and service. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review, as outlined below. The evaluation portfolio shall cover the period June 1 of the previous year to May 31 of the current year.

- All evaluation portfolios should begin with a narrative statement and department checklist as well as a completed workload table as found in Appendix C.
- Corroborative material is encouraged and should be submitted in additional, but separate, binder(s) with the exception of faculty seeking tenure or promotion or appealing department recommendations. Corroborative materials may not be examined beyond the departmental level; therefore, faculty are encouraged to make a convincing case in their AR/CAR forms and narrative statements.

Materials considered part of the evaluation portfolio that are not physically present may include:

- Recordings of on-site performances mentioned in the evaluation portfolio that are contained in the Department of Music archives.
- Digital materials on web sites, which are mentioned in the evaluation portfolio.
- Faculty are encouraged to consult the *ART Document* for information regarding supporting materials. Broad evidence, especially in the area of teaching, facilitates the peer review process.

D. Departmental Evaluation Portfolio for Annual Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Not Seeking Promotion or Five-Year Review

Each faculty member must prepare a departmental evaluation portfolio, submitted in a three-ring binder, that includes the following, in the order listed:

- A completed checklist to verify contents.
- A faculty Annual Report with clear articulation of the teaching load (AR/CAR Part I of the year under review and both the approved Part II of the AR/CAR that articulates the agreement for that work as well as the new Part II articulating work for the upcoming year).
- A current *curriculum vitae*.
- A syllabus for each course taught during the year under review.
- Evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - Student evaluations including all qualitative and quantitative data as tabulated by an administrative entity other than the faculty member. The Department of Music currently uses a University generated on-line student evaluation system. Complete reports from this system must be included in the faculty evaluative portfolio.
 - Grade distributions, when provided by the University
- Faculty must add spring evaluation numbers, if provided, to their AR/CAR no later than the second Friday in August.
- The Department merit letter to be added upon receipt from the departmental PTRM Committee after fall evaluation.
- Supporting materials are not required, but if submitted they should be indexed as such.

Each faculty member will also prepare a manila file folder for the Department Chair's files that includes copies of the:

- AR/CAR I and II [Part II from the year under review].
- A current *curriculum vitae*.

- Department merit letter to be inserted by Department Chair following deliberations in the fall.

E. Expanded Evaluation Portfolio for Annual Evaluation of Non-Tenured Faculty Not Requesting Tenure and/or Promotion

The evaluation portfolios of non-tenured faculty should be submitted in a three-ring binder and will be cumulative, including all required materials from every year since the date of hire.

In addition to the materials listed in Section B above, the three-ring binder will also include:

- Peer and/or Chairperson’s evaluations of teaching signed by the faculty member and the evaluator.
- PTRM Committee letters for all years since date of hire.
- Chair’s letters for all years since date of hire.
- Supporting materials are required and should be submitted in a separate binder. This binder will not be forwarded beyond the Department unless requested.
- Faculty should submit the same annual materials to the Department Chair in a manila file folder as described in section D above.

F. Expanded Evaluation Portfolio for Third-Year Review

1. Policies and procedures for expanded evaluation portfolios for third-year review follow *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure* [ART document] excerpted below in addition to departmental policies that follow.

ART, APPENDIX 3, III, D, 5:
Third-Year Review

a. 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.

b. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the department’s PTRM committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion.” (See Appendix C checklist.)

c. 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.

d. 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.

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

f. Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the Department PTRM Committee Chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written letter will be shared with the Dean. In accordance with Section III.B.3, the faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that he/she has read, but does not necessarily agree with, the evaluation.

g. If a faculty member's Mandatory Tenure-Review Year is prior to the sixth year of continuous, full-time service, the standard Annual Review by the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

2. Dimensions of Review. Candidates during their third year of service will be evaluated on three primary dimensions: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. Balance among dimensions is to be achieved through the workload as developed by faculty, Chair and Dean. In addition, a faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship as demonstrated by humane, ethical and professional behavior.

3. Procedure. At the conclusion of the Fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, tenure track faculty should prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the department's PTRM Committee. The intention of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure by advising and mentoring the faculty member. This includes providing:

- assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified; and
- encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.

The faculty member should submit materials for the previous two and one-half years as if the faculty member were applying for tenure and/or promotion. The department PTRM Committee will evaluate the materials and indicate to the faculty member, in writing:

- whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
- what suggestions the PTRM has for a positive decision at the end of the tenure track period.

This written letter will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level. It will be shared with the Dean but will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM Committee or the Provost. Again, the purpose of the review is to serve as an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member.

4. Evaluation portfolio. For purposes of the Third Year Review, the following materials (as describe in the TU ART Document Appendix 3 – I.B.3.a-c) will be needed:

- All items listed in Sections C & D above.
- Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years and fall semester of the third year.

- Student and peer/Chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year.
- 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.
- Documentation of scholarship and service.

5. Review Procedures: “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 will include 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.” (ART p. 22-23 – III.D.5.c.i.ii.)

6. The three-level scale as defined above from the ART document will serve as a general guideline for the review: Superior progress, Satisfactory progress, Not satisfactory progress.

7. Timetable: For purposes of review during a faculty’s third year:

- All documentation is due to the Chair of the department PTRM Committee by the third Friday in January.
- Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the department PTRM Chair no later than the first Friday in March. This feedback also will be shared with the Dean. Feedback is to serve an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member. The faculty member should receive feedback related to teaching (including advising and mentoring), scholarship, and service in detail as deemed sufficient by the department.

8. Accelerated Track Review. In the circumstance where a faculty has been hired on an accelerated tenure-track timetable, the agreement between faculty and Dean or Provost shall supersede the third year review. In those instances, the regular Annual Review by the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

G. Expanded Evaluation Portfolio for Faculty Seeking Promotion, Tenure, or Promotion and Tenure, or Undergoing Comprehensive Five-Year Review.

Policies and procedures for expanded evaluation portfolios follow *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure* [ART document] excerpted below in addition to departmental policies that follow.

ART Appendix 3L I.B.9:

In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion, tenure and 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. 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) or Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR I & II) Forms arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section III

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

Peer teaching evaluations for tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review.

Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period, including a copy of the survey instrument. Faculty should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using approved departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time.

Section IV

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

Section V

Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);

Written recommendation of the department PTRM 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 of the college.

The comprehensive five-year review binders must also include any additional required materials that may be requested by the Provost. Sections I-IV of the summative portfolio for the comprehensive five-year review will be identical to those of P&T binders and will cover the five (5) years under review. (See I.B.10.) Section V must include the following:

- a. Final evaluation of the departmental PTRM Committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form
- b. Letter of evaluation from Department Chairperson; and
- c. Letter of evaluation from academic Dean of the college.

I.B.11. Additional documentation responsibilities

- iii. The Dean of the college shall assure that the summative portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.
- iv. 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.

In addition to the Provost binder, supporting materials are required and should be submitted in a separate binder that will include:

- Documentation of all claims of accomplishment during the review period;
- Internal peer observation letters;
- Syllabi of all courses within the review period;
- Performances, workshops, master classes, conferences, etc., require programs or other corroborating materials such as recordings;
- Hard copies should be provided for selected scholarship/creative activity and especially work completed during sabbaticals;

Supporting materials are required and should be submitted in a separate binder(s). This binder(s) will not be forwarded beyond the Department unless requested;

Faculty should submit the same annual materials to the Department Chair in a manila file folder as described in Section D (above);

Faculty simultaneously seeking promotion and undergoing five-year review will submit only a single evaluation portfolio.

H. Deadline for Submission

All levels of evaluation portfolios must be submitted to the Department Chair's Office by 4 pm on the third Friday in June. Failure to do so will normally result in non-consideration for merit, promotion, reappointment, tenure, or continuation of teaching load reduction.

I. Materials Added to the Evaluation Portfolio by the Faculty Member, Department Chair, or PTRM Committee Chairperson(s) After the June Deadline

Procedures for adding materials to evaluation portfolios follow *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure* [ART document] excerpted below in addition to departmental policies that follow.

ART Appendix 3L I.B.4:

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 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 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 Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

ART Appendix 3L I.B.5:

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.

Department of Music policies and procedures:

After the June deadline, the following items will be included in faculty evaluation portfolios as indicated:

- The Department PTRM written letter with recommendation providing a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count inserted by the PTRM Committee Chair(s) (For reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion & comprehensive review);
- The Department Chair's detailed letter with recommendation inserted by the Department Chair. (For reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion, & comprehensive review);
- The PTRM Committee merit letter inserted by the PTRM Committee Chair(s). (All faculty under review.)

If a faculty member adds anything except student evaluations to his/her evaluation portfolio after the June deadline, the faculty member informs the Department Chair of the specific addition made. The Department Chair will then inform PTRM members of the addition(s) by email.

All information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio departmentally must be submitted by the second Friday in August.

If the Department Chair 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 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 University Faculty Handbook). Failure to notify the faculty member within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

The PTRM committee can advise a colleague, even after dossier review and vote, to revise a narrative, teaching philosophy, or remove items from the dossier that are not warranted by the Provost's requirements or the department's PTRM requirements. If the faculty member elects to make any changes, such changes must be completed by the faculty member before the university PTRM calendar's deadline for a colleague altering their dossier.

VIII. DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC PTRM COMMITTEE

A. PTRM Membership, Structure, and Responsibilities

The PTRM Committee is comprised of all tenured Department of Music faculty, including the Department Chair.

- The Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the department PTRM Committee.
- A quorum is defined as a simple majority of the voting members of the PTRM Committee.
- The Department Chair and PTRM Committee Co-Chairs are responsible for delivering the written recommendations and decisions of the committee to the candidates and to the COFAC P&T Committee. (See Appendix G, Department PTRM calendar, for deadlines.)

- The Department of Music representative to the COFAC P&T Committee must be a member of the PTRM Committee and is elected by the eligible voting membership of the COFAC. This person conveys decisions of the Music Department PTRM Committees to the COFAC P&T Committee.
- Lecturers do not serve on the department of music PTRM committee and the Department Chair and appropriate unit coordinator or designee appointed by the Department Chair review and evaluate the Lecturer's annual review portfolio in accordance with COFAC PTRM Lecturer guidelines.
- Should the number of faculty eligible to serve on the Department of Music PTRM Committee fall to below five (5), then the Department Chair may petition the Dean to have tenured faculty from other COFAC departments serve on the committee.

PTRM Committee Structure

The PTRM committee is charged with review, deliberation, voting and report writing for evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty seeking reappointment, three-year review, five-year comprehensive review, promotion to Associate Professor, and/or tenure, and merit.

C. Procedures for Deliberation on Merit, Promotion, Tenure & Review:

Procedures for deliberations follow the Department of Music PTRM Document and *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure* [ART document].

Department of Music policies and procedures:

- Prior to June 1, the outgoing PTRM Co-Chairs will pass on to the Department Chairperson a report of the assigned PTRM duties and the department PTRM work calendar from the year during their leadership for purposes of helping the next Co-Chairs do their work.
- For decisions of merit and five-year comprehensive review as well as for approving reports, a tie vote is considered affirmative. For decisions regarding tenure, promotion to associate or full professor and reappointment, a simple majority vote is required to be affirmative.
- For its deliberations, the PTRM Committee should focus on the written standards provided by the university, college, and department.
- Prior to any meeting, committee members must have examined evaluation portfolios of faculty to be discussed at that meeting and/or other pertinent materials.
- PTRM members must leave the room when their case is discussed and may not vote on it.
- As part of the PTRM review process, the PTRM Committee will review all evaluative portfolios for untenured, tenure-track faculty.
- The Department Chair will be evaluated for five-year review, promotion, as well as for merit by the PTRM committee.
- Faculty who are absent from discussions and deliberations may not vote by proxy. Some examples include committee members who are on sabbatical, at a conference, or sick. Faculty on sabbatical may vote if they have reviewed the material and are present at the meeting.
- By the end of the fall semester, the PTRM Committee will convene to elect two of its members to serve as its Co-Chairs, who will begin their term starting June 1.
- There is an expectation of confidentiality outside of the department PTRM committees.

- Deliberations concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate or Full Professor begin with faculty who choose to make opening statements not to exceed one minute. When everyone wishing to speak has spoken the Department Chair is invited to make a report generally not to exceed five minutes. Open discussion and a vote then follows. Except in cases of promotion and tenure, discussion should not exceed thirty minutes.
- Committee letters are prepared following deliberations and must articulate and support the decision of the PTRM Committee and include the precise vote tally and recommendation for reappointment, promotion, tenure and/or five-year review. Committee members who detect factual errors, including issues regarding spelling and grammar, should communicate them to the letter writer.
- The original draft, clearly labeled “FIRST DRAFT,” will be sent by the letter writer via email to the PTRM Committee. Letters are to employ the Department format and template, including signature and date lines.
- Suggestions for revisions will be sent via email only to the letter writer but communication outside of PTRM meetings, including the suggestions for revision can be discussed between PTRM committee members as they see fit keeping to rules of confidentiality.
- Once the deadline for requests for revision is past, the letter writer prepares a revised letter, clearly labeled “REVISED DRAFT”. The revised draft is then sent via email to all members of the PTRM Committee. The letter writer will attach to that email copies of all requests for revision received from PTRM Committee members.
- Members of the PTRM Committee will carefully read the revised drafts prior to the meeting during which final letters are approved. If any committee member requests it, the letter will be discussed during the meeting prior to voting. If there are no such requests, then the letter will be voted on without discussion.
- Once approved by the PTRM Committee, the revised draft is known as the “FINAL LETTER”. The letter writer will give the Department Chair four hard copies of the final letter.
- Within two weeks following the completion of all meetings between faculty and PTRM Co-Chairs when FINAL LETTERS are presented to each faculty member, PTRM Co-Chairs will place a hard copy of each FINAL LETTER in a binder within a secured location to be made available to all PTRM members until Nov. 30.

D. Committee Assignments for All Non-Tenured Faculty and Tenured Faculty Requesting Promotion or Undergoing Five-Year Review

- A letter writer and two observers will be appointed by the PTRM Committee Chair(s) in consultation with the Department Chair. Appointments should be accomplished by the middle of February.
- Whenever possible at least one of the three will be chosen from the same division as the faculty member.
- PTRM Committee Chair(s) are excused from service as a letter writer or observer.

E. Peer Observation

- All non-tenured faculty seeking tenure, and also non-tenured or tenured faculty undergoing five-year review will be observed twice during the spring semester. In the event of a negative observation letter, a faculty member may request that a third observation be made.

- Two PTRM Committee members should be assigned to observe first year faculty during their first semester.
- Two PTRM Committee members should be assigned to observe each faculty in the fall semester of their third year for purposes of the third-year review.
- For tenured faculty undergoing five-year review, two observations normally spread across four semesters are required for the dossier.
- Observations should be completed by mid-semester. Observers will attend different teaching assignments.
- Observation letters, ordinarily one page in length, are a critical analysis of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. The letter is not intended to be a chronological listing of events, quotations, discussions, etc., but rather a critical document that uses those items to support a conclusion. Writers should consult the template in Appendix D.
- Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
- Observers are responsible for consulting with the faculty member to set a mutually agreeable observation date. This consultation takes place at least one week prior to the observation. Failure to obtain such agreement will render an observation null and void, and the observation will not enter the evaluation portfolio or deliberations.
- Observers should obtain a copy of the syllabus for the course being observed and review online course materials, if the course uses them.
- After the observation, observers write the letters that are presented at a meeting with the faculty member within fourteen days of the observation date.
- The observer meets with the observed faculty member and gives the faculty member a copy of the letter and discusses it. The observed faculty member signs a second copy indicating its receipt, and this copy is submitted to the Department Chair.
- For tenure-track colleagues, the Chairperson can do his/her own additional teaching observation(s) and letter(s) at his/her choice for his/her optional PTRM letter that is made outside of the faculty PTRM process and reporting. Those observations will be included in the colleague's dossier for full faculty review. As with peer observations, the Chairperson must give the observed faculty member notice a week in advance a peer observation occurs.

F. Meetings Schedule

- The PTRM Committee will meet at times consistent with the ART Document calendar.
- The PTRM Committee will convene for additional meeting(s) to approve letters; these meeting(s) are ordinarily scheduled during the regular faculty meeting time.

G. Process for Deliberations and Deadline for Letters

- The first meeting of the PTRM Committee is to conduct deliberations followed by secret ballot votes for promotion, tenure, reappointment, five-year review, and merit. This meeting will not take place until after the deadline to add materials to the dossiers has passed. The results will be tabulated immediately, announced to committee members, and entered on the appropriate forms.
- The Department PTRM committee may, but is not required to, review for reappointment tenure-track faculty who have completed their 3rd-5th year of employment, but the faculty member must be reviewed for merit during every year. In such cases the merit report for that faculty member should be expanded.

- The decision whether or not to review for reappointment tenure-track faculty who have completed their 3rd-5th year of employment is made by the Department PTRM committee in its first meeting of the fall semester before discussion and voting takes place. Decision is by majority vote.
- Letter writers will complete and distribute original drafts of their letters that must articulate and support the decision of the PTRM Committee or, where applicable, the PTRM subcommittee timely manner per the Department PTRM calendar in compliance with the ART document. Draft letters must reflect the committee/subcommittee decision including the precise vote tally and recommendation for reappointment, promotion, tenure and/or five-year review.
- PTRM committee letters are evaluative and not lists of things that were done. The evaluation should be articulated in connection to specific written expectations in the Department's PTRM document.
- Letters should speak to whether or not the colleague did not meet, met, or exceeded the expectations under discussion. Specific items of work should be used only to support such evaluative statements and not substitute for them.
- Letters should reference (clearly cite, explain, and apply) department standards of teaching, scholarship, and service; connect them to a faculty member's accomplishments with examples; and evaluate how the faculty member did not meet, met, or exceeded these department standards. Committee letters should reflect the main points of discussion, including dissent.
- Committee/subcommittee members read the original drafts and submit any requests for revision in a timely manner per the Department PTRM calendar after the original drafts are distributed.
- Letter writers complete and distribute revised in a timely manner per the Department PTRM calendar.
- Committee/subcommittee members read the original drafts and submit any requests for revision in a timely manner as per the ART Document after the original drafts are distributed.
- Letter writers complete and distribute revised in a timely manner as per the ART Document for revision requests.
- Department PTRM committee/subcommittee letters with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are to be submitted to the Department Chair by the second Friday in October.
- Department Chair's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is to be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member by the fourth Friday of October.
- The Department Chair and Committee Co-Chairs together will meet with faculty to present, discuss and sign their PTRM letter by the fourth Friday in October.
- Factual errors contained in the letter may be identified by the faculty member and enumerated in writing to the PTRM Committee Co-Chairs no later than one week after the meeting. The PTRM Committee Co-Chairs resolves any discrepancy with the letter writer. Copies, signed by all appropriate parties, are given to the faculty member and the Department Chair.

IX. REAPPOINTMENT

“Reappointment of third through fifth year faculty”

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

The Department Chair, in consultation with the department PTRM committee, may direct that the recommendation on reappointment of third through fifth year faculty be made before August 1 so that notice of non-reappointment, if recommended, is provided faculty by August 1 prior to the third or subsequent year of service as applicable.

The evaluation shall occur pursuant to the schedule established by the Department Chair in consultation with the departmental PTRM Committee. 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 of the Provost’s decision, which is final.

X. MERIT

Policies and Procedures for Merit follow *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure* [ART document] excerpted below in addition to departmental policies that follow.

ART Appendix 3D. 1 Annual Review for Merit:

- a. The department PTRM committee shall annually review faculty for merit as appropriate.
- b. 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.
- c. 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” (Section I.B). The faculty member shall submit the evaluation portfolio to the Department Chair no later than the third Friday in June.
- d. 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 PTRM committee(s) all the evaluation portfolios for all faculty members in the department.
- e. The Department Chair shall not be a voting member of the department PTRM committee(s).
- f. The department PTRM committee(s) shall evaluate these evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written letter, 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 PTRM recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

j. The department PTRM committee Chairperson shall forward the evaluation portfolio, PTRM and Chair recommendations and the department vote count record to the Dean's office by the second Friday in November.

k. 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.

l. Faculty may appeal a negative recommendation for merit at any point in the process, following the procedures outlined in Appeals of Negative Recommendations (Section V); however, the appeal shall not stay the merit review process.

m. 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.

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

i. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.

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

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

Each department will explicitly and clearly define the above categories for use in their merit deliberations.

Department of Music Policies and Procedures:

A. General

In conjunction with cost-of-living adjustments to faculty salaries, which should be mandated annually, Board of Regents regulations require that merit salary increases be awarded using a merit system that results in differential increments. The “Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Faculty,” the “Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations (AFWE),” section of the Annual Report (AR form Part II), or the “Chairperson’s Annual Report (CAR form)” 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.

Faculty will be evaluated each year at the department level for merit.

Because promotion and tenure decisions are based on long-term contributions, annual merit decisions do not necessarily indicate progress toward tenure or promotion. There are three possible recommendations:

- Not Meritorious: Faculty whose performance fails adequately to meet explicit standards.
- Satisfactory (Base Merit): Faculty whose work is deemed competent and thus contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, college, and department. Faculty receiving Satisfactory Merit (Base Merit) must document teaching effectiveness in their evaluation portfolio.
- Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Faculty who are not only deemed satisfactory but who also excel in at least one of the dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty receiving Excellent Merit (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit) must document teaching effectiveness in their evaluation portfolio.

B. Criteria

- Faculty can document professional competence by meeting the expectations shown in the “Expectations for All Music Faculty” portion of this document and by successfully completing work contracted through the workload document. Faculty should negotiate a workload that accurately reflects what they plan to accomplish. When workload projections change significantly during the year, the workload document should be renegotiated to reflect the change.
- Documentation of teaching effectiveness involves a combination of factors: consistent class or lesson attendance; adequate preparation; publication of syllabi that demonstrate a thoughtful approach to learning and clearly state expectations, grading procedures, etc.; appropriate use of technology, etc. No letter should include quantitative data in regard to student evaluations.
- Members of the PTRM Committee will judge the quality of faculty teaching, scholarship, and service. However, the diverse activities of the faculty in the Department of Music preclude use of specific criteria to be generalized over the entire faculty.

C. Procedures

- Annual merit evaluations focus on basic criteria such as effective teaching, evidence of current scholarship, and evidence of effective service during the one year under review.
- Promotion, tenure, and five-year post tenure review deliberations employ more complex and detailed standards, for each rank, over the many years under review. The inclusion in PTRM materials of such required items as a teaching philosophy, summary analysis of student evaluations over time, comments about peer evaluations, supporting statement that articulates one's line of scholarly endeavors, and commentary about one's continuing trajectory as a scholar also highlight the difference between the relatively simple criteria of annual performance evaluations and the more elaborate standards of promotion, tenure, and five-year post tenure review deliberations.
- For decisions of merit and merit letters for faculty members being reviewed for tenure and promotion with tenure, the full PTRM committee as a whole will review, meet, and vote.
- For decisions of merit and merit letters for the Chairperson, the full PTRM committee as a whole will review, meet, and vote.
- For decisions of merit and merit letters for faculty members being reviewed for reappointment, promotion without tenure, 5-year review, the two subcommittees will review, meet, and vote.
- Each member of the PTRM Committee must carefully read evaluation portfolios as assigned to their sub-committee (described above).
- For voting on merit, the PTRM committee and its subcommittees will use the official merit ballots from the Provost.
- The PTRM Co-Chairs will assign merit letter writers for each faculty member under review for merit.
- The PTRM Committee Chair(s) records the merit vote and the merit letter writer for that review prepares a brief letter for each faculty member using the merit letter template in Appendix D of this document; the statement will include the rationale clarifying the decision of the PTRM Committee. In the case of excellent merit (base +), the statement will also include language indicating and supporting that recommendation.
- The merit recommendations of the subcommittee evaluations will be shared with the whole PTRM Committee.

XI. PROMOTION

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.

XII. COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Upon earning tenure, a faculty member begins a cycle of reviews conducted every five years. The Department Chair will maintain records and notify the PTRM Committee Chair and all tenured faculty of the review rotation schedule. A tenured faculty member who has been promoted will have his/her five-year clock reset to five years after the year of promotion.

2. The process of comprehensive review is similar to that for promotion. Faculty requesting promotion during the same year as their comprehensive review can present a single narrative report and evaluation portfolio to cover both cases.
3. The Committee uses the candidate's expanded evaluation portfolio along with its observations as the basis for the review. The Committee may adopt the candidate's narrative as accurate and true or it may submit a written letter detailing any discrepancies or problems identified.
4. The faculty member under review is responsible for preparing an expanded evaluation portfolio and writing a detailed five-year narrative report not to exceed five typed pages. For tenured faculty undergoing five-year review, two observations normally spread across four semesters are required for the dossier.

XIII. REBUTTALS AND APPEALS

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. (ART 3-5)

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 (Section V); however, an appeal will not stay the evaluation process. (ART 3-26)

Department of Music policies and procedures for appeals follow *The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure*. Please consult ART Appendix 3: V. APPEALS AND NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS for specific details.

The President's decision on reappointment, tenure, promotion and comprehensive five-year review shall be final. The Provost's decision on merit shall be final.

Department of Music policies and procedures:

- The language of merit letters and letters for promotion, reappointment, tenure, and five-year review cannot be appealed. Exception is made in the case of factual error in a letter in which case the faculty member should consult with the Chair of the PTRM Committee, which has jurisdiction for correction.
- Appeals to decisions of the PTRM Committee should be made in writing and addressed to the COFAC Dean with copies to the Chair(s) of the PTRM Committee, the Music Department Chair, and the COFAC P&T Committee Chair. The timeframe for appeals for all negative judgment 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.

XIV. REFERENCE SOURCES

Additional information concerning tenure and promotion:

Towson University ART Document:

<https://inside.towson.edu/generalcampus/tupolicies/documents/02-01.00%20Towson%20University%20Policy%20on%20Appointment,%20Rank%20and%20Tenure%20of%20Faculty.pdf>

Towson University Senate – PTRM Website <http://www.towson.edu/senate/ptrm.asp>

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR MUSIC DEPARTMENT FACULTY IN PREPARATION OF EVALUATION PORTFOLIOS

TEACHING

1. Teaching students in classes, ensembles, lessons, recitals, practica, internships, etc.

The standard and expectations for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- Responsiveness to cultural and individual differences
- Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation, and grading of student performance
- Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology in one's teaching
- Content of courses and teaching processes are supportive of department and/or program mission
- Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation and student evaluation
- Availability to students
- Reflection and growth in teaching methodology
- Recognition in the department and college of the quality of one's teaching
- If applicable, has met contractual obligations for approved off-campus activities such as sabbatical leave, international teaching exchanges, grant-supported research, etc.

The standards and expectations for promotion to Professor: The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- Excellence in teaching
- Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching, and contributions to the departmental needs

2. Advising students

The standards and expectations for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The above standards and expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: The above standards plus these additional standards:

- Accessible to assist students with academic questions
- Knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
- Accurate in the advice given to students

The standards and expectations for promotion to Professor: The above standards for tenure plus this additional standard:

- Mentoring colleagues in effective advising

3. Mentoring student scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensives, independent study projects, theses, artistic productions or products such as recitals, concerts, shows, recordings, etc.)

The standard and expectations for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standards and expectations for tenure and promotion:

- Recognized expertise in the content and/or technical skills required for student scholarship
- Effective guidance and advisement that enable students to complete their research, creative activity, and/or scholarship successfully
- Ability to evaluate the outcomes or products of student scholarship

4. Developing course and program curricula

The standards and expectations for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standards and expectations for tenure and promotion:

- Knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field
- Knowledgeable of changes in licensure, certification, and accreditation standards in one's field
- Refinement, updating, and improvement of courses that one teaches
- Effective and successful participation in course and program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or one's sustained experience with practitioners in one's field

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

1. Conducting research and generating new knowledge or creative products

The standards and expectations for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision

The standards and expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- A clearly defined scholarship/creative activity agenda and focus
- Knowledgeable about alternative approaches to conducting research, including research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting and interpreting results
- Expertise in methodologies appropriate to one's scholarship and/or creative activity agenda
- Efforts to obtain funding to support one's scholarship or creative goals
- Evidence that one's research agenda or artistic achievement has matured over time
- Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship/creative activity

The standards and expectations for promotion to Professor: The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- A sustained record of conducting and reporting empirical research in one's field or a sustained effort in a particular medium or style
- Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field or unique artistic expression
- Distinction in the quality of one's scholarship/creative activity

2. Synthesizing and integrating knowledge

The standards for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- Currency in the knowledge base that undergirds one's field of inquiry

- Application of that knowledge base to one's teaching, service, and other professional activities
- Continued interaction with others internally and externally who share one's knowledge base

The standards for promotion to Professor. The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to integrate knowledge in their field
- Reviews of the knowledge base in one's field, identification of critical themes, and recommendations for extending that knowledge base
- Generation of new theories and models based on the knowledge base in one's field

SERVICE

Note: Although diverse profiles of service contributions are anticipated among candidates, it is expected that, over time, all candidates will demonstrate service in the three domains identified below: to one's profession, to practitioners, and to the institution.

1. In service to the institution

The standards for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision

The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- Involvement in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, college, university or system levels
- Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise, including international faculty exchange
- Advocacy in addressing important institutional issues
- Recognition of the quality and impact of one's service

The standards for tenure and promotion to Professor: The standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- Leadership in addressing important institutional issues
- Distinction in the quality of one's service to the institution at program, Department, College, University or System levels

2. In service to practitioners and community

The standards for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standard, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- Sustained involvement in the work of practitioners in one's field
- Contributions to practitioners and community that draw upon one's professional expertise
- Advocacy in addressing needs of practitioners in one's field
- Recognition by others of the quality and impact of one's service to practitioners and community

The standards for tenure and promotion to Professor: The standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- Leadership in addressing issues in one's field
- Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance

3. In service to one's profession

The standards for reappointment: The standards for tenure with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.

The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

- Sustained involvement in professional organizations and associations in one's field at state, regional, national, and/or international levels
- Contributions to a professional organization or association that draw upon one's professional expertise
- Advocacy in addressing important issues relevant to one's profession
- Recognition by others of the quality and impact of one's service to professional organizations

The standards for promotion to Professor: The standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- Leadership in addressing important issues relevant to one's profession
- Distinction in the quality of one's service to professional organizations

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR PTRM LETTERS

The goal of a letter is the thorough assessment of a candidate's contributions (especially teaching) to the department, college, university, and profession.

- Annual merit letters are based upon achievement from June 1 of the previous academic year through May 31 of the current year.
- Letters other than for merit written by the Department PTRM committee should be addressed to the Provost.
- Tenure and promotion letters are cumulative; while the reporting period is the previous academic year, all letters for tenure-track faculty, other than those regarding merit, should reference and address any issues raised in previous letters.
- Letters may recognize both strengths and weaknesses of a candidate.
- Because new faculty are chosen on the basis of highly competitive national searches the Letter should assume a certain level of excellence upon hiring. Positive letters should acknowledge this excellence, be encouraging and complimentary.
- All faculty can improve their skills as teachers, scholars and performers through vigorous peer review. Critiques should be as specific as possible and include suggestions for future improvements.
- Evaluative judgments may be supported using quotations from students, faculty, professional colleagues and external reviewers.
- Teaching observations and annual reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure letters should ordinarily be one page in length; negative or controversial letters may need to exceed that length. Cumulative letters recommending tenure, promotion, three-year review, or five-year review should be three pages in length.
- One-page letters ordinarily should contain one paragraph for each of the dimensions of teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service.
- Candidates should be identified in the letter with the word "Professor" first then subsequently as "Prof." before their last name.
- The letter must include the precise vote tally and recommendation for reappointment, promotion, tenure, three-year review, and/or five-year review.
- Committee letters should reference (clearly cite, explain, and apply) department standards of teaching, scholarship, and service; connect them to a faculty member's accomplishments with examples; and evaluate how the faculty member did not meet, met, or exceeded these department standards. Committee letters should reflect the main points of discussion, including dissent.
- Letters should refrain from communicating that close votes are unusual or that they represent a form of negative outcome. Close votes can result in reports that lay out areas for improvement, but the reports should not read as a warning of potential negative outcome unless the vote was negative in the majority.
- Letter writers should consult the *Towson University ART Document* Appendix 3: II.C.1-4 for definition of evaluation categories regarding General Principles, Teaching/Advising Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service.

The following are general Music Department guidelines:

Teaching: Faculty should be concerned with excellence in teaching and demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively and promote student mastery of skills, concepts, and materials. Observation letters of teaching may include but need not necessarily be limited to the following points:

1. Organization of the course, including objectives, syllabus, handouts, and evaluation procedures;
2. Evidence of relevant teacher expertise;
3. Clarity and relevance of goals for the class period observed; student achievement of those goals within the class period;
4. Organization of instruction and efficient use of time;
5. Interaction between students and teacher; effectiveness of teacher's communications; evidence of appropriate response to relevant student input offered during the class, rehearsal, or lesson.

Scholarship/Creative Activity: See ART Document Appendix 3: II.C.3 for a detailed description of scholarship. Faculty are expected to commit to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty. This commitment includes awareness of recent scholarship, pursuit of continued personal scholarly growth, and involvement in professional organizations.

Service: See ART Document Appendix 3: II.C.4 for detailed description of scholarship. Faculty will actively serve on departmental, college and/or university committees as well as professional organizations, and will participate in department, division, and committee meetings.

Letters should conclude with a candid overview of the committee's opinion and include the vote tally. Tenure Letters should include a statement of progress toward tenure.

APPENDIX C: CHECKLISTS

The follow checklists were compiled to assist faculty in preparing their promotion and tenure evaluation portfolios. All items on the checklist must be in conformance with the main document.

Workload Definition

The Department of Music recognizes the University's policy that 8 units (1 unit = one three-credit course or its equivalent) represent a load expected of all faculty per academic year. Full-time faculty in the Department of Music calculate their workloads which consists of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service, administration, and other assignments, in 3-credit course load measures or their equivalent. A 3-credit course equals 3 load credits, or one unit as defined above. A one-hour private lesson equals 0.67 load credits. A full-time position must account for twenty-four (24) credits or 8 units each year. Justification of the teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service load is contained in the AR/CAR parts I and II for each year.



Department of Music
Evaluation Portfolio Checklist for the First Submission of First Year Non-Tenured Faculty
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

The following materials should be submitted in an organized indexed three-ring binder. This will be reviewed by the Department PTRM Committee. This is due no later than the second Friday of December.

- _____ A reflective summary of teaching, scholarship, and service, highlighting activities and accomplishments during the first semester;
- _____ SENTF form;
- _____ Peer evaluation(s) from the first semester;
- _____ Department Chair's letter (if written);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ Syllabi of courses during the first semester under review;
- _____ Documentation of Scholarship and Service.

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ Copy of SENTF form;
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*.

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____



Department of Music
Evaluation Portfolio Checklist for the First Year Non-Tenured Faculty (Second Submission)
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

The following materials should be submitted in an organized indexed three-ring binder. This will be used by the Department PTRM Committee and then forwarded to the College:

- _____ SENTF form;
- _____ AR Form (Copy of AR Part I for the year under review);
- _____ Peer evaluation(s) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ PTRM letter and merit letter (added by the PTRM Committee in the fall);
- _____ Department Chair's letter (if written);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ Syllabi of courses during the year(s) under review;
- _____ Evaluations of teaching and advising (the computer printouts with all quantitative and qualitative summaries of student evaluations) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ University generated student evaluations & grade distributions for all courses taught;
- _____ Documentation of Scholarship and Service.

Additional supporting materials are not required but if submitted, should be in a separate binder.

- _____ OPTIONAL (check here if you are adding other items such as written comments from student evaluations, letters of congratulations, etc.).

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ Copy of SENTF form;
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*.



Department of Music
Evaluation Portfolio Checklist for Non-Tenured Faculty
Not Requesting Tenure and/or Promotion
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

The following materials should be submitted in an organized indexed three-ring binder. This will be used by the Department PTRM Committee and then forwarded to the College:

- _____ AR Forms (Copy of AR Part I and Part II's for the year under review) and SENTF form from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ Tenure Review Committee (or PTRM) letter(s) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ merit letters from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ Department Chair's letter(s) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ Syllabi of courses during the year(s) under review;
- _____ Evaluations of teaching and advising (the computer printouts with all quantitative and qualitative summaries of student evaluations) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ Peer teaching evaluation(s) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ University generated student evaluations & grade distributions for all courses taught;
- _____ Documentation of Scholarship and Service.

It is important you verify that the grade distributions for spring courses were updated in the most recent year's AR Part I. Additional supporting materials are not required but if submitted, should be indexed as such.

- _____ OPTIONAL (check here if you are adding other items such as written comments from student evaluations, letters of congratulations, etc.).

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ Copy of AR Part I and Part II's for the year under review.



Department of Music
Evaluation portfolio Checklist for Tenured Faculty
Not Seeking Promotion
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

The following should be submitted in a three-ring binder:

- _____ AR (Copy of AR Part I and Part II's for the year under review)) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- _____ Evaluations of teaching and advising (the computer printouts with all quantitative and qualitative summaries of student evaluations) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first;
- _____ Peer observations, if any, completed during the year under review;
- _____ University-generated grade distributions for all courses taught;
- _____ Current year's merit letter added after the fall evaluation;
- _____ Past merit letters should not be included in annual merit review dossiers;
- _____ Documentation of Scholarship and Service.

It is important that you verify that the grade distributions for spring courses were updated in the most recent year's AR Part I. These reports may not be received until summer.

- _____ Updated grade distributions and evaluations of teaching for spring courses in AR or CAR Part I.

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ AR Part I for year under review; or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ AR Part II of the preceding and for the upcoming year, or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*.



Department of Music
Evaluation portfolio Checklist for Faculty
Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

Three submissions are required: the first, a three-ring binder, will be used by the Department PTRM Committee and then sent forward to the College and Provost. Additional documentation can be submitted in a second binder, and copies of certain forms also need to be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder.

THE THREE-RING-BINDER: Materials to be sent to the Department, College, and Provost. Label the binder with your name, department, and area of review. Do NOT use plastic sheet protectors. Binders that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the College.

Section I Curriculum vitae

- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ Copy of *one* recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.

Section II University Forms

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

Section III Student Teaching Evaluations and Peer Teaching Evaluations

- _____ Summary of Student Evaluations across the evaluation period (the computer printouts with all quantitative and qualitative summaries of student evaluations); 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;
- _____ Narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/Chairperson evaluations;
- _____ Peer Teaching Evaluations.

Section IV Supporting Statement

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

\

Section V Recommendations [the College P&T Chairperson and the Dean have the responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations are included in the folder.]

- _____ Written recommendation of the department PTRM Committee, including the Departmental Summary recommendation form (DSR);
- _____ Written recommendation of the academic Chairperson;
- _____ Written recommendation of the college P&T committee;
- _____ Written recommendation of the academic Dean.

THE SECOND BINDER (OR ADDITIONAL BINDERS): This binder or these binders will be retained at the Department unless requested by the College.

- _____ Syllabi of courses for years under review;
- _____ Other corroborative materials including evidence of scholarly/creative activity (not included in materials being forwarded to the Provost);
- _____ Cumulative Tenure or Rank Committee or PTRM letters (the most recent will be inserted by Department Chair), if applicable;
- _____ Cumulative Chair letters, if any;
- _____ Peer observation letters from current year;
- _____ Current year's merit letter added after the fall evaluation;
- _____ Past merit letters should not be included in promotion and tenure dossiers;
- _____ OPTIONAL: other items such as written comments from student evaluations, letters of congratulations, etc.

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ Copy of summary narrative statement highlighting the year's accomplishments;
- _____ AR Part I for year under review; or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ AR Part II of the preceding year and for the upcoming year, or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*.



Department of Music
Evaluation portfolio Checklist for Tenured Faculty Undergoing
Five-Year Comprehensive Review
(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

The following should be submitted in a three-ring binder, which will be used by the Department PTRM Committee and then sent forward to the College and Provost. Additional documentation can be submitted in a second binder, and copies of certain forms also need to be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder.

THE THREE-RING BINDER: Materials to be sent to the Department, College, and Provost. Label the binder with your name, department, and area of review. Do NOT use plastic sheet protectors. Binders that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the College.

Section I Curriculum vitae

- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ 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 from the past five years arranged starting with the most recent.

Section III Student Teaching Evaluations and Peer Teaching Evaluations

- _____ Summary of Student Evaluations across the evaluation period (the computer printouts with all quantitative and qualitative summaries of student evaluations) from the date of hire with the most recent appearing first; 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;
- _____ Peer Teaching Evaluations.

Section IV Supporting Statement

- _____ Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service; This should also include a statement outlining the faculty member's goals and expected career development plans for the upcoming five-year period.

Section V Recommendations [the College P&T Chairperson and the Dean have the responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations are included in the folder.]

- _____ Final evaluation of the departmental PTRM Committee;
- _____ Letter of evaluation from the Department Chairperson;
- _____ Letter of evaluation from the academic Dean.

THE SECOND BINDER(S)

This binder will be retained at the Department unless requested by the College.

- _____ Syllabi of courses for years under review;
- _____ Other corroborative materials including evidence of scholarly/creative activity (not included in materials being forwarded to the Provost);
- _____ Current year's merit letter added after the fall evaluation;
- _____ Past merit letters should not be included in five-year review dossiers.

In addition to the above one copy of each of the following should be submitted to the Department Chair in a manila folder:

- _____ Copy of narrative statement highlighting the year's accomplishments;
- _____ AR Part I for year under review; or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ AR Part II of the preceding year and for the upcoming year, or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report);
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*.



**Department of Music
Evaluation portfolio Checklist for Non-Tenured Faculty Undergoing
Third-Year Review**

(Consult ART document pages 3-3 ff. for further information)

Include this checklist with your evaluation portfolio in the order specified.

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

- _____ 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 agreement for the period under review;
- _____ Faculty Annual Reports (AR parts I and II) with clear articulation of the teaching load for all years under review;
- _____ Current professional *curriculum vitae*;
- _____ A syllabus for each course taught during the years under review;
- _____ Student and peer/Chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year;
- _____ Grade distributions, when provided by the University for all courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
- _____ PTRM Committee letters for all years since date of hire Past merit letters should not be included in five-year review dossiers;
- _____ Chair's letters (if received) for all years since date of hire;
- _____ Material from the Fall semester, which may be included in a complete Annual Report;
- _____ Documentation of scholarship and service. Supporting materials are required and should be submitted in a separate binder. This binder will not be forwarded beyond the Department unless requested.

Faculty members undergoing third-year review will also prepare a manila file folder for the Department Chair's files that includes copies of the:

- _____ Faculty narrative statement;
- _____ Faculty Annual Reports (AR I and II);
- _____ A current *curriculum vitae*.

Printed Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX D: PEER OBSERVATION TEMPLATE

Peer Observation, Department of Music

Instructor:

Course No./Sec:

Date of Observation:

Observer:

Course Format -- Course Objectives:

Organization -- Course management:

Syllabus:

General Impressions -- Course environment:

Clarity of Presentation or Instruction:

Suggestions/Additional Comments:

Conclusion:

Signatures

The signatures below acknowledge presentation and receipt of the observation letter.

Observer: _____

Candidate: _____

APPENDIX E: PTRM LETTER TEMPLATE:

**LETTER ON PROFESSOR (XXX)
NATURE OF LETTER:
(DATE OF LETTER)**

Introduction:

Current academic rank:

Year of hire:

Review period: June 1, xxxx-May 31, xxxx.

Dear Provost _____,

Professor XXX's evaluation portfolio was individually reviewed by the Department of Music PTRM Committee and last discussed in the Committee meeting on (date). In addition to assigned peer observations the members of the PTRM Committee drew upon their own personal observations of Professor XXX's accomplishments. [Text addressing any incomplete and/or missing items should be included here.]

Teaching :

(No letter should include quantitative data in regard to student evaluations.)

Scholarship and Creative Activity:

Service:

Conclusion:

On (date) the Department of Music PTRM Committee voted x in favor, x opposed, and x abstaining to recommend that Professor xxx (**be** or **not be** reappointed, granted tenure, promoted to the rank of xx, approved for five-year review). [For third-year review add: Professor xxx is making (insert qualifier here) progress towards tenure.]

The signatures below acknowledge presentation and receipt of the letter.

Prof. [Name], Co-Chair, Dept. of Music PTRM Committee

Date

Prof. [Name], Co-Chair, Dept. of Music PTRM Committee

Date

Prof. [Name], Chairperson, Department of Music

Date

Prof. [Name of faculty member under review]

Date

APPENDIX F: MERIT LETTER TEMPLATE:

**LETTER ON PROFESSOR X
ANNUAL MERIT RECOMMENDATION
DATE LETTER WAS APPROVED BY VOTE**

Current academic rank:
Year of hire:
Review period: June 1, xxxx-May 31, xxxx.

Dear Dean _____,

Professor xx's annual merit portfolio was reviewed by the Department of Music PTRM Committee during the fall semester of xxxx (year). [Text addressing any incomplete and/or missing items should be included here.]

Brief paragraph about teaching including supporting evidence of effective teaching or excellent teaching if this is a basis for the case for Base+ merit for teaching.

(No letter should include quantitative data in regard to student evaluations.)

Brief paragraph about scholarship and creative activity including supporting evidence of excellence if this is a basis for a case for Base+ merit for scholarship and creative activity.

Brief paragraph about service including supporting evidence of excellence if this is a basis for a case for Base+ merit for service.

On [DATE], the PTRM committee voted [] for excellent (base+) merit, [] for meritorious, and [] for not meritorious. As a result, the Department of Music PTRM committee recommends [LEVEL OF MERIT, if meritorious] level of merit for the area of {AREA OF MERIT, if meritorious} completed during the review period.

In compliance with the rules of the Music PTRM Document approved at the department, college, and university levels, this letter designates and provides evidence of the decision. [Include the following sentences if meritorious:] Included is evidence supporting the one area of excellence for faculty recommended for {LEVEL OF MERIT, if meritorious}. This recommendation does not mean that a faculty member is not excellent in other areas as well; indeed, the Department does not recommend faculty for Base+ merit unless their contributions in the other two dimensions are at least meritorious.

The signatures below acknowledge presentation and receipt of the letter.

_____ Prof. [Name], Co-Chair, Dept. of Music PTRM Committee	_____ Date
_____ Prof. [Name], Co-Chair, Dept. of Music PTRM Committee	_____ Date
_____ Prof. [Name], Chairperson, Department of Music	_____ Date
_____ Prof. [Name of faculty member under review]	_____ Date

APPENDIX G: CALENDAR OF DEPARTMENTAL PTRM DEADLINES

- Co-Chairs of the department PTRM committee and the Chairperson cannot instruct the PTRM committee to modify PTRM review deadlines or calendars, or otherwise change the PTRM calendar or procedure that all tenure-track faculty undergo other than those specified in the approved departmental PTRM document or in the ART document (Appendix 3).
- For tenure-track faculty member currently in their 3rd-5th year of employment, the alternate calendar language in the ART document (Appendix 3) provides a modified PTRM committee review calendar that can happen over the summer months in order to discuss and vote on reappointment for the year after the year immediately coming in that fall. A Quorum of the PTRM committee is required for such a meeting to proceed.
- For tenure-track faculty member currently in their 3rd-5th year of employment, the Chairperson can call for a PTRM committee meeting over the summer months, after the ART document-defined third Friday in June deadline for all PTRM dossiers, in which the committee would discuss and vote on that colleague's reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. A quorum (51% of members) of the PTRM committee and attendance by at least one of the two elected department PTRM co-Chairs (not proxies) is required for such a meeting to proceed.
- The reason to enact the modified PTRM calendar tenure-track faculty member currently in their 3rd-5th year of employment would be to make it possible for that colleague to be terminated over the following summer and not receive the traditional 'grace' year of employment after termination that is part of the normal tenure-track procedure. If a termination decision is made as a result of that summer action, the colleague would be employed for the academic year that begins in August immediately following the summer meeting. The colleague could appeal the decision during that year per the ART document appeals policies and procedures.
- If such a summer meeting of the PTRM committee occurs, it takes the place of the department-level reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion review for that faculty member, that would normally take place during the fall semester. If the outcome is a positive vote for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion during the summer meeting, then the merit review for that faculty member would take place normally in the fall semester.

By 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.
- 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 Second Friday in August: Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1

The Third Friday in September:

- Faculty notify Department Chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next Academic Year.

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

The Fourth Friday in September: Department Chairperson notifies department faculty, Dean, and Provost of any department faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next Academic Year.

The Second Friday in October: Department PTRM committee's letters 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, promotion, tenure, and 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 letter 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 30: All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

- Deadline for rebuttals.
- 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 document is 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 15 (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 - The department PTRM committee letters with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

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 letter 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 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.

By the first Friday in May: the PTRM elects Co-Chairs to serve for the upcoming year.