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DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE PROMOTION, TENURE, AND RETENTION COMMITTEE

(Adopted May 2, 2000, Modified December 9, 2008, Revised 12 May 2011)

Additional information concerning tenure policies and procedures may be obtained by reading the current Towson University Faculty Handbook.

I. Preamble

A. The basic statements of faculty requirements and expectations are established by the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents and are stated in the University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty and the University System of Maryland Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities. Towson University (TU) statements include the TU Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit and the TU Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities.

B. Separate committees in the Department of Biological Sciences are responsible for tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review policies (Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Committee, hereafter PTR Committee) and for review of merit (Merit Committee).

C. Confidentiality. All points of discussion and votes of the Committee should be treated as strictly confidential.

II. Tenure Committee Composition/Officers

A. The PTR Committee of the Department of Biological Sciences shall be composed of all full-time tenured Biology faculty and those faculty members who are in the final year of their probationary period and who have been approved by the University for tenure effective the following fall semester. The department chairperson will serve on the department PTR Committee as an ad hoc (non-voting) member and will prepare a separate evaluation.

B. The Chairperson and Secretary shall be elected in alternate years for two-year terms by majority vote of the committee by the first Friday in May. The Chairperson and Secretary will have the same voting privileges as other committee members.

a. Duties of the Chairperson of the PTR Committee.
   1. Call and conduct meetings.
   2. Insure that the policies of the department as well as those of the college and university are followed.
   3. Prepare appropriate forms for recommendations to the College Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Merit (PTRM) Committee.
   4. Appoint members of the PTR Committee to serve on subcommittees.
   5. Call for and presents suggestions for changes to the tenure document.
   6. Conduct elections of officers of the PTR Committee.
   7. Schedules classroom observations by subcommittees.

b. Duties of the Secretary of the PTR Committee.
   1. Record the outcome of deliberations and votes.
   2. Maintain records of the tenure committee.
   3. Assist the Chairperson in duties so designated.
III. Procedure for meetings
   a. A quorum shall be three-fourths of the eligible PTR Committee members including the
      Department Chair.
   b. Faculty on leaves, sabbatical leaves or with assigned duties outside the department for
      a semester or year may choose to exempt themselves from voting. This decision must
      be in written form to the Secretary of the PTR Committee, and, without a letter to the
      contrary, faculty members on sabbatical leave can vote.
   c. Policy votes shall be by simple majority of those present and voting. Tie votes will result
      in reopening discussion followed by subsequent vote. If after two votes a decision
      cannot be made, the question will be tabled until the next meeting.
   d. Votes on acceptance of faculty five-year plans, reappointment, requests for
      consideration of an early tenure decision, tenure recommendations and promotion
      recommendations require a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting. Any
      abstention needs to be approved by the Provost
   e. Any member of the PTR Committee who cannot attend a meeting at which candidates
      are discussed may submit to the PTR Chairperson a written statement concerning the
      candidate(s). This statement should be documented as fully as possible and would be
      read at the meeting and destroyed immediately thereafter. No proxy or absentee votes
      may be counted.

IV. Departmental Policies and Procedures Governing Evaluation of Tenure Track and Non-tenure Track
    Full-Time Faculty

   A. Frequency
      1. The total number of probationary appointments for any tenure track individual will be as
         stipulated in the faculty member's letter of appointment.
      2. The PTR Committee shall consider the desirability of granting reappointment and tenure,
         where appropriate, to tenure track during their first and each subsequent year of service.
      3. Under exceptional circumstances a faculty member may request an early decision on tenure
         prior to the end of the probationary period. A faculty member who is being considered for
         tenure prior to his/her mandatory tenure review year, || and any faculty member who is
         being considered for promotion, may withdraw from the evaluation process for promotion
         and/or tenure review at any time prior to submission of their portfolio to the Provost. A faculty
         member who is being considered for tenure during his/her mandatory tenure review year
         may not withdraw from the evaluation process.

   B. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

      The Department of Biological Sciences recognizes the individuality of professional
      accomplishment by its faculty, and therefore it does not have a rigidly specific, quantitative set of
      standards for tenure and promotion. This is in line with the general criteria and standards for
      promotion and tenure as stated by the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics, which the
      Department adheres to (see Item III- http://www.towson.edu/FCSM/faculty/ptrm/PandT-
Policies.asp). In addition to the FCSM Criteria for Promotion and Tenure the following criteria are
      specific to faculty in Biological Sciences

      1. Teaching
         This criterion concerns the individual's teaching effectiveness in the "normal" classroom
         situation, on field trips, in student project supervision and in any other activities related to
         teaching courses within the university. The individual should possess a comprehensive
knowledge of pertinent subject material and have the ability to lecture, conduct discussions, answer questions, encourage independent thought, and direct laboratory experiences. Additionally, class preparation, reading, developing new courses and curricula, learning new or innovative methods and practices, grading assignments and exams, and advising students are to be considered as components of teaching.

2. **Scholarship**

   Evidence of scholarly growth includes not only increasing one’s general knowledge of his/her field, but also conducting research and other creative activities and participating in professional organizations and/or meetings. Scholarly growth is not confined merely to learning; it must also be an exercise of the methodology of one’s chosen discipline; that is, such growth will almost certainly yield tangible evidence in the form of publications, exhibits, lectures, recitals, and other products. Research and scholarly expression need not be only the highly original kind which advances knowledge, such critical and analytic activities as writing of book reviews or review essays should be encouraged, as well as the compilation of the results of current research into a paper or book which can be used for instruction. In one of these ways -- original research or expression, critical analysis, or synthesizing existing data -- the good teacher should give evidence that he/she is functioning as a scholar.

3. **Service**

   Service includes activities related to the institution, discipline, and community.

C. **Methods of Evaluation for Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty**

1. **Creation of subcommittee.** Prior to the first semester of a tenure-track faculty member’s appointment, a subcommittee will be formed and charged with the responsibility of guiding and evaluating that faculty member. This subcommittee will consist of two permanent PTR Committee representatives chosen by the PTR Committee Chairperson in consultation with the Chair of the Department for their ability to evaluate and direct the newly appointed individual’s professional development. The two permanent members will alternate years serving as Subcommittee Chair. In addition to the Subcommittee, a senior member of the faculty will likewise be selected to mentor the newly appointed individual on an informal basis.

   a. **Modification of the subcommittee due to absence.** In the event that a permanent member of a subcommittee would be unable to complete his/her responsibilities as a co-chair for the duration of the subcommittee, a new permanent member will be appointed following the procedures in Paragraph 1 above. Examples of events that would initiate such a change might include an administrative appointment, retirement, or severance. Should a permanent member be away on sabbatical leave for a defined term, The Chairs of the PTR Committee and the Department will appoint a temporary replacement.

   b. **Modification of the subcommittee by request of the tenure-track faculty member.** The tenure-track faculty member may ask for a change in the permanent members of the subcommittee with a written request to both the Department Chair and Chairperson of the PTR Committee. This request must be detailed and the specifics of the request will remain confidential. The Department Chair and the PTR chairperson will consult to determine if changing composition of the subcommittee is warranted, and, if so, they shall select a new permanent member. The Department Chair will explain the generalities of the change to the outgoing member of the subcommittee without providing any specifics of the written request.
2. **Requirements and Expectations of Tenure-track Faculty.** The Subcommittee will explain and obtain the signature of the statement of Requirements and Expectations of Tenure-track Faculty (Appendix A). This form will be placed in the faculty member’s permanent tenure file and a copy provided to the faculty member. This will be completed prior to the beginning of the first semester of his/her appointment.

3. **Development of five-year plan.** The Subcommittee will be charged to work with the newly appointed faculty member to develop a specific five-year professional development plan. This plan must contain specific goals appropriate to institutional, departmental, and individual needs regarding teaching, service, and scholarship, and must contain benchmarks that indicate achievement of goals. (For example, a specific goal might be the development of a research program that involves undergraduate and graduate students, and benchmark indicators might be publication of peer-reviewed papers in area of specialty, presentations at scientific meetings, and receipt of extramural funding.) This plan must be developed by the third Friday in September and will be subject to approval by the Promotion and Tenure Committee as a whole.

4. **Classroom observation.** The Chair and Secretary of the PTR Committee will determine which tenured faculty will participate in classroom teaching observations in a given semester. Observation in the classroom of the newly appointed faculty member shall be arranged by the Subcommittee Chair to be completed by the third Friday in October. The Subcommittee Chairs and the tenure-track faculty member will mutually agree upon the time and dates of the observations. The tenure-track faculty member must be given an advance notice of at least one (1) week. Each subcommittee Chair will normally participate in one observation with two to three additional tenured faculty present at each visit. Following the classroom observation, each observer will prepare a written report evaluating faculty performance (Peer Evaluation form, Appendix B). Evaluation should include examination of course materials such as syllabus, exams, etc. Following the classroom observation, the subcommittee will meet with the newly appointed faculty member to discuss the classroom observation report that will be provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5. **Report to the PTR Committee.** The tenure subcommittee will report to the PTR as a whole on the newly appointed faculty member by the dates established by the University Calendar (See Appendix C-Important Dates). The PTR will discuss and vote to approve the newly appointed faculty member’s five-year plan. Approval will require acceptance by two-thirds of all committee members present and voting. Upon approval, the five-year plan will be used to evaluate the newly appointed faculty member throughout their probationary period, and cannot be altered without mutual approval of the faculty member and two-thirds of the PTR Committee. In the event the PTR Committee does not approve the five-year plan, the tenure subcommittee will work with the newly appointed faculty member to develop a revised five-year plan to be brought to the PTR Committee by the first Tuesday in December. The approved five-year plan will be added to the candidates permanent tenure file.

6. **Spring classroom observation.** A newly appointed faculty member must be observed in the classroom in each of the first two semesters of their appointment. In the second semester, at least two new representatives of the tenure committee will replace the faculty mentor and the rotating member on the tenure subcommittee. Observations and evaluation will be conducted as described previously (see #4 above).

7. **Annual Review.** In the second year of a tenure-track faculty member’s appointment, and every year thereafter during the probationary period, the tenure subcommittee will conduct an annual review of that faculty member’s progress. Committee members will
examine the Annual Report of the probationary faculty member from the previous year and compare this with the goals and benchmarks stated in the five-year plan. Additional material supporting the Annual Report may be included in this review. The subcommittee chair may schedule a meeting of the subcommittee with the tenure-track faculty member to aid in gathering information. The subcommittee must prepare a written report detailing their assessment of the probationary faculty member’s professional development. The classroom observation results from the previous spring should be included in this report. This annual review must be completed and forwarded to the Promotion and Tenure Committee by the dates established by the University Calendar (See Appendix C-Important Dates)

8. **Modification of five-year plan.** The tenure-track faculty member may request modifications to her/his five-year plan. These changes must be forwarded to the PTR Committee prior to the third Friday in September. Any modifications must receive a two-thirds affirmative vote of the PTR Committee.

9. **PTR Committee assessment and reappointment decision.** The subcommittee will present its annual review to the PTR Committee as a whole by the dates established by the University Calendar (See Appendix C-Important Dates). The written report will be discussed, and either approved or modified, as deemed appropriate by PTR Committee. The final version must be acceptable to two-thirds of the PTR committee present and voting. Following acceptance of the written report, the PTR Committee will vote on the reappointment of the tenure-track faculty member following the voting guidelines stated in VI D below. A two-thirds majority positive vote of those voting is necessary to recommend reappointment. The final version of the report will be provided to the probationary faculty member. The Chairs of the subcommittee will meet with the faculty member to explain the position of the PTR Committee. The probationary faculty member, the chairperson of the PTR Committee, the Chairs of the tenure subcommittee, and the Departmental Chair, must all sign this final version of the annual review. The signed annual review will be added to the candidates permanent tenure file. The recommendation for reappointment will be recorded on the DSR form to be submitted to the College PTRM Committee, by the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

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

11. **Appeals.** The process for appeals of the PTR Committee follow those of the FCSM, and are outlined in Appendix D (Appeals Procedures)

12. **Continued classroom observation.** Tenure-track faculty must be observed in the classroom, each year, throughout their probationary period. In addition the new faculty member must be observed in any new course he/she teaches. The Chair of the tenure subcommittee will arrange for classroom observations as described previously (see #4 above). Observations will take place during the spring semester unless a new course is offered initially in the fall semester. Each spring, the non-permanent members of the tenure subcommittee will be replaced so that every member of the PTR Committee has the opportunity to participate in a probationary faculty member’s evaluation.
13. **Third-year review:** At the conclusion of the Fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, the department PTR Committee shall conduct a “Third Year Review” of tenure-track candidates. The purpose of the review is to serve an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member. The review will be done in concert with the Guidelines for Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship and Service, as described in the Towson University Faculty Handbook, Addendum A. Candidates will be evaluated on three primary dimensions: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. As noted below, department 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.

**A. Dossier:** At the conclusion of the Fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, tenure track faculty should prepare a dossier of activities for evaluation by the department’s PTR committee. For purposes of the Third Year Review, the materials needed are outlined in Appendix E.

**B. Third-year evaluation:** The PTR committee will assess the third year review candidate and will produce a clear statement of progress toward tenure. All documentation is due to the Chair of the PTR Committee by the dates established by the University Calendar (See Appendix C-Important Dates), both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department Chair and the Chair of the PTR Committee. This feedback also will be shared with the Dean. This evaluation serves an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member. The faculty member should receive feedback related to teaching, scholarship and service in detail deemed sufficient by the department. A three-level scale provides a guideline for evaluation:

1. **Superior progress.** Performance in teaching, scholarship and service that projects excellent progress towards tenure.
2. **Satisfactory progress.** Developing towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service. The department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.
3. **Unsatisfactory progress.** Change by the faculty across one or more dimensions is necessary. This means that continued performance at this level is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

**VI. Tenure Recommendation Procedures**

A. Tenure review will follow the calendars of the University committees. The calendar is found in Appendix C.

B. The tenure review normally occurs in the penultimate year of the probationary period. The department may, in exceptional circumstances and at the request of the tenure track faculty, make a tenure recommendation earlier than the normal tenure review date.

C. Prior to the meeting at which the ballot will be cast, the candidate’s dossier containing annual reports and observer evaluations from his/her years of probation will be made available to Tenure Committee members. Faculty Tenure/Promotion dossiers must be submitted to the Department Chair or designees by the third Friday in June. However, faculty may update their dossier until the third Friday in September, regarding work done prior to June 1.

D. The order in which candidates will be discussed and voted upon will be determined by drawing lots. Votes will be cast in the form of a closed ballot. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID
number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee’s recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file for three (3) years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. To be recommended for tenure within the Department of Biological Sciences, at least two-thirds of the PTR Committee members present must approve the recommendation.

E. In the event of a decision not to recommend tenure, notice shall be delivered in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

F. Appeals of the final decision of the PTR Committee follow the process outlined in Appendix D (Appeal Procedures).

VII. Promotion Recommendation Procedures:

A. The Calendar of the promotions process follows the dates established by the University (See Appendix C-Important Dates).

B. Documents required are outlined in Appendix E (Instructions for the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics (FCSM) Promotion & Tenure Dossier).

C. Letters of Evaluation for Promotion to Professor

**Letters of evaluation from external reviewers** will be solicited from outside the University pursuant to the Guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate. In general, external evaluators should not be current or former mentors, students or collaborators within the past five years, nor should they pose other significant potential conflicts of interest. Candidates may also submit names of those persons that they prefer NOT be asked to write an evaluation. The external evaluation will address the candidate’s scholarship as it relates to the candidate’s promotion to Professor. The letters will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These letters will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

**Contents of the evaluation dossier to be sent to external reviewers:** Reviewers will be provided with a description of the mission and teaching and research expectations of Towson University, the Fisher College, and the Department of Biological Sciences, to provide context for the review. The materials to be sent to external reviewers who have agreed to provide a review will be in electronic format only. They should be limited to:

- A curriculum vitae
- The applicant’s supporting statement focusing on the area of scholarship and reflecting on accomplishments during the evaluation period
- A maximum of three (3) publications or other scholarly products, either as readable files or internet links thereto. The external evaluators will be able to request additional items on the candidate’s curriculum vitae by contacting the Department Chairperson
VII. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

A. Selection of faculty for review
1. Faculty are to be reviewed five years after being granted tenure and at least every fifth year thereafter.
2. Faculty are to be reviewed in the event that, when evaluating the faculty member for merit, an “Unsatisfactory” rating was given in the same area (i.e., teaching, service or scholarship) two consecutive years. The review is made in the year following the second Unsatisfactory evaluation.
3. Schedule for reviews will be updated by the Chair of the PTR Committee yearly and made available to faculty.

B. Documents used in evaluation
1. Faculty up for comprehensive review will submit a dossier in a single three-ring binder, as indicated in Appendix E, Section VIII.
2. The PTR Committee will add to the dossier their evaluation of teaching based on the observation that they will make.

C. Procedure
1. The Chair of the PTR Committee appoints two or three PTR Committee members to serve on a subcommittee for the comprehensive review of a faculty member.
2. The subcommittee arranges for and makes classroom observation of faculty, prepares a teaching evaluation, reviews the dossier provided by faculty, and prepares a written comprehensive evaluation of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This evaluation must clearly indicate whether the subcommittee finds performance in these areas “acceptable” or “unacceptable” and must contain a detailed, written explanation of why the faculty member’s performance is being evaluated as such.
3. The written evaluation is read and discussed by full PTR Committee and amended as appropriate.
4. The full committee then votes, by secret ballot, as to whether they Approve or Disapprove of the written recommendation. A majority of committee members must agree to send the written evaluation to the College in its current form. In the event that such a majority is not obtained, further discussion, revision of the written recommendation, and voting will ensue until such majority is reached.
5. As per TU Policy, all votes regarding comprehensive reviews taken by any committee shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee’s recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university. No committee member shall abstain from voting unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
6. Committee members disapproving of the majority’s evaluation may singly or collectively prepare their own evaluation or a rebuttal to the majority’s evaluation and add it to the faculty member’s dossier alongside the majority evaluation.
7. The chair and/or secretary of the PTR Committee will provide a copy of each written evaluation (including minority evaluations/rebuttal) to the faculty member. The committee will also report, in writing, the number of committee members that voted to Approve or Disapprove of the majority’s evaluation (i.e., the size of the majority). All written evaluations are to be signed by the faculty member and returned to the PTR Committee secretary or designee. Specifically, the faculty member will sign a statement indicating that s/he has read the evaluation. This signature is not intended to indicate agreement with the evaluation. Failure to sign shall not prevent any document from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.
8. If five-sevenths or greater majority of faculty members deem a faculty member’s performance in
any area (teaching, service, or scholarship) “unacceptable,” this will be considered a “negative evaluation.” Negative evaluations must be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address. A negative evaluation that is not overturned on appeal, automatically triggers the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member’s failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. Details are provided in the University’s PTRM policies and procedures document.

9. In the event that the faculty member under review wants to challenge, rebut, or appeal the committee's evaluation, they must follow procedures outlined below (Appendix D).
Appendix A

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

(Readopted, February 10, 2000)

1. **General**: Faculty members in the Department of Biological Sciences are expected to fulfill general University requirements for all faculty (See Faculty Handbook).

2. **Teaching load**: An average of nine (9) contact hours is typical. In order that electives with small enrollments may be offered, instructors may be assigned up to 12 contact hours on occasion. The latter arrangement would be assigned only if agreed upon by the faculty member involved. All scheduled course hours are to be met except in the case of emergency or sickness unless prior permission has been obtained from the Department Chairperson. For core courses in the Department, a common syllabus has been prepared and accepted. Faculty should not deviate markedly from the basic syllabus.

3. **Course scheduling**: Specific course assignments are discussed at the time of hiring. Consistent with department needs, effort is made to assign courses on the basis of the individual instructor’s preferences. Faculty members will be expected to teach, when asked, the more general, introductory courses and the specialty course(s) agreed upon at the time they were hired. This expectation does not apply to off-load courses which are available on an additional pay basis.

4. **Other responsibilities**:
   a. Advising of students: Departmental faculty members are assigned a number of biology majors as advisees.
   b. Committee and special task assignments: Faculty members are expected to participate in faculty governance within the department. Faculty members are encouraged to serve on college and university-wide committees.
   c. Miscellaneous requirements: Attendance and participation at all department meetings is both an obligation and an opportunity to be part of the Departmental decision making process. Periodically, faculty must fulfill other responsibilities necessary to the functioning of the Department and University (e.g., participation in commencement ceremonies).
   d. Scholarship: Faculty members are expected to be active scholars. Evidence of scholarship is evaluated for tenure and promotion decisions.
   e. Tenure, promotion, and merit considerations: These policies are described in separate policy documents made available to each new faculty member.
I have read the preceding statements and will abide by these expectations of biology faculty members.

________________________________________________
Faculty Member Date

________________________________________________
Department Chairperson Date

________________________________________________
Dean of College Date
Appendix B

PEER TEACHING EVALUATION REPORT

TO: PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

FROM: SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF

RE: EVALUATION FOR CONSIDERATION OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE OR PROMOTION

SUBMITTED BY:

DATE:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A. Course in which the faculty member was observed (no. and name):

B. Date of Observation:

C. Presentation and content:

D. Methodology:

E. Interaction with students

F. Summary of general performance:

The above statement is an accurate summary of our evaluation:

Signature of each subcommittee member:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C: Important Dates

The Third Friday in September in the year prior to an evaluation Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

The Fourth Friday in September in the year prior to an evaluation 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 First Friday in May Department and FCSM PTRM Committees are formed (elections for membership on the FCSM PTRM 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.

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

The Third Friday in September
- FCSM PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM Committee (if necessary).
- Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.
- First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Second Friday in October
- Department PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
- FCSM PTRM documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.

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 report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

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

November 30th
- All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the
evaluation portfolio.

The Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

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

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

December 15th (USM mandated date) Tenure-track faculty in their second and subsequent 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 reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
- The FCSM PTRM Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the Dean.

The Third Friday in January
- The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- The FCSM PTRM Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
- The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.
- All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.
- Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The First Friday in February
- The FCSM Dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the Committee's and the Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.
- The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment of first year faculty to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

The Second Friday in February
- The Dean, 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.
- 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.
- Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.
March 1st 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. Department to vote to changes in current PTR document.

Third Friday in March Provost's letter of decision on promotion and/or tenure is conveyed to the faculty member, department and FCSM PTRM Committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and Dean of the FCSM.
Appendix D: Appeal Procedures

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

B) There are three (3) types of appeals.

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

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

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

  c) Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of FCSM recommendations shall be copied to the FCSM Dean and the FCSM PTRM Committee.

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

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

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

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

  a) Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM Committee.

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

  c) Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the Dean and the University PTRM Committee chair. Appeals of FCSM recommendations shall be copied to the FCSM Dean, the FCSM PTRM Committee, the department chair, and the University PTRM Committee chair. Appeals of the Provost's recommendations shall be copied to the Dean and department chair.

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

  e) Recommendations of the University PTRM Committee may be appealed to the
President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the University PTRM Committee will monitor the appeal process.

3) Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 — Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.
Appendix E: Instructions for the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics (FCSM) 
Promotion & Tenure Dossier

Each FCSM faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure is expected to prepare a dossier that addresses the professorial expectations of faculty in the University, the FCSM and the candidate’s department. The materials in Sections A through D of this document should be organized into one (or more) three-ring loose leaf binder(s) in the indicated sequence, separated and indexed with tabs. This document addresses the organization of the dossier only and in no way is to be interpreted as setting or clarifying existing or future promotion and tenure policies for the FCSM.

Section A: Summary and Recommendations

Cover Page. The dossier begins with a cover sheet that includes the candidate’s name, highest degree, present rank, department, date of appointment at Towson University and rank awarded, number of years of credit for prior service, dates for leaves of absence (with the purposes of the leaves indicated), and dates and places of previous promotions. This cover sheet should state the candidate’s area of specialization within the discipline. The following format must be used (lines not applicable should be omitted):

Name
Highest Degree
Present Rank
Department
Date of TU Appointment and Rank Awarded
Number of Years of Credit for Prior Service (A copy of the letter stating the award should be attached.)
Leaves of Absence (Descriptions and Purposes)
Dates and Places of Previous Promotions and Ranks Awarded
Areas of Specialization within the Discipline
Proposed Rank

Tab A.1. Curriculum Vitae

Tab A.2. Summary of Major Accomplishments. A statement written by the faculty member is required for all promotion and/or tenure recommendations. This concise summary should highlight accomplishments of special merit and should include a statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met the teaching, scholarship, and service expectations of the FCSM and University. (A typical summary is two or three pages in length.)

Tab A.3. Recommendations. The written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee; and the written recommendations of the department chairperson, of the FCSM PTRM Committee, and of the Dean of FCSM must be included. (Note: Letters from the FCSM Committee and the Dean will be added to the binder and copies given to the candidate.)

Tab A.4. Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) forms for the Entire Evaluation Period. The candidate should submit Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) forms for the entire evaluation period. These forms should be arranged from most recent to the time of last evaluation, promotion or year of hire. A copy of the current year’s Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) form must be presented to the candidate prior to submission of the candidate’s binder to the FCSM PTRM Committee.

Tab A.5. Fisher College of Science and Mathematics Promotion and Tenure Form (FCSM P&T Form).
Tab A.6. SENTF or Annual Reports (AR Parts I and II) for the Entire Evaluation Period. The candidate should submit annual reports for the entire evaluation period. These forms should be arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section B: Teaching

The general expectation of the Fisher College is that teaching is the central function and that all faculty members strive to be outstanding teachers. Assessing teaching performance, however, is extremely difficult. Generally, no single criterion can be used to adequately judge teaching performance.

Categories for Teaching. The following are the required categories for teaching and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly.

Tab B.1. Courses Taught During the Evaluation Period: The candidate must provide a list of courses taught using the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX to 20XX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fall, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The candidate must provide a copy of the most recent syllabus used for each course taught at Towson University during the evaluation period. Only one syllabus for each different course is required. Additionally quantitative student evaluation scores as designated by the department as well as complete student evaluation qualitative responses for each class should be included.

Tab B.2. Peer Reports of Class Visits A minimum of one per year for tenure-track faculty and at least one within the last two years for candidates for promotion to Professor). The following are additional potential categories for teaching and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly.

Tab B.3. On-load Student Advising (Document the number of students/year, mentoring, special advising activities, etc.)

Tab B.4. Honors or Special Recognition for Instruction: List and document.

Tab B.5. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, Theses, and Dissertations: These items should be listed as follows: Independent Studies: Name of student(s), title of project, and date completed.

Practica: Name of student(s), title, and date completed.
Honors Theses: Name of student(s), title, and date completed.
Theses: Name of student(s), title, and date completed.

Tab B.6. Curriculum Materials: List textbooks written by and articles published by the candidate related to the candidate's instruction. A copy of each article must be provided. For books, provide photocopies of the cover, title page, and table of contents.

Tab B.7. Other Materials: The candidate should include other documents that he or she considers to be relevant for teaching that do not appear in the categories above (e.g., new courses developed, international teaching exchange, sabbatical activities related to teaching, etc.).
Section C: Scholarship

The FCSM recognizes that faculty members may undertake four types of scholarship as defined by the well-known Boyer Model: the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The general expectation of the FCSM is that all faculty members should be able to demonstrate the presence of an active and ongoing program of scholarship in one or more of these forms. The faculty member needs to demonstrate the ability to initiate and carry to completion scholarly work at Towson University in his or her research specialty. Scholarly work is considered validated when it is submitted for peer review and deemed worthy of publication or other form of dissemination. Submission for peer review of competitive proposals for extramural funding is also a valid form of scholarship. This section should begin with a table of contents listing all documents that support the areas of scholarship listed below.

Categories for Scholarship The following are the potential categories for scholarship and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly.

Scholarly Writings in Journals, Books, Monographs, and Reviews:

Tab C.1.a. Books and Monographs, For published works, give the title, publisher, and date of publication. For works accepted for publication, indicate whether an item is a book manuscript in press and scheduled for publication at a definite date.

Tab C.1.b. Articles in Peer-Reviewed Journals. For published or accepted articles, give the title, journal, volume, page numbers, date (or projected date of publication), names of the authors as they appear in print. For manuscripts submitted for publication, indicate whether the article has been published, is accepted for publication, or has only been submitted. Co-authors who are students should be identified as such.

Tab C.1.c. Conference Publications. Give the title, authorship, date, name and location of the conference, and whether the publication was peer reviewed. Co-authors who are students should be identified as such.

Tab C.1.d. Book Reviews, Abstracts, and Reports. Give the title, author, place of appearance, and date of publication or projected publication. Co-authors who are students should be identified as such.

DOCUMENTATION

Within each relevant tab, provide copies of articles, book reviews, etc., listed in paragraphs a through d, above. For books, provide photocopies of the cover, title page, table of contents, etc., within the tabs. In the case of articles, books, monographs, book reviews, abstracts, and reports accepted for publication but not yet published; provide copies of letters of acceptance, agreements and contracts. In the case of works submitted and under review, documentation showing that the submission has been received and is being considered is required.

Tab C.2. Presentations at Professional Meetings: A list of presentations at professional meetings should be provided. This should include the title and date of the presentation, and the name and location of the meeting. DOCUMENTATION: Provide either official acceptance letters or photocopies of the meeting agenda listing the presentation title and authorship.

Tab C.3. Awards and Grants: List scholarships, fellowships, travel awards, personal development grants, grants funded by or submitted to local agencies, and grants from national agencies. DOCUMENTATION: Provide official letters of award indicating the amount and period
of the award, and the precise role of the candidate and any other co-principal or co-investigator in the research or required activities funded.

Tab C.4. Science Education and Mathematics Education Workshops: List professional development workshops and other activities organized or led by the candidate. Indicate the candidate’s role in each workshop or activity. The list should include dates of service, and documentation should be provided.

Tab C.5. Significant Professional Services: List memberships on editorial boards, activities as referee for scholarly journals, activities as referee for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, and services as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. Include only those activities that are a reflection or outcome of the candidate’s scholarly expertise (other professional service activities may be included within Section D). Documentation verifying the activity should be provided.

Tab C.6. Recognition by National, Scholarly, and Professional Associations: List and include titles of honors, awards, fellowships, and internships. A copy of the award letter or other documentation should be provided.

Tab C.7. General Recognition Within One’s Discipline: List requests for colloquium presentations or workshops, and any other general recognition. Copies of invitation letters or official programs should be provided. A list or a summary of citations and references to the candidate’s work by others may be included.

Tab C.8. Other: List and include here materials for which descriptions are not presented in any of the other categories above. These materials may not include work in progress.

Section D: Service
The general expectation of the Fisher College is that all faculty members should be actively engaged in service, to the department, the College, the University community, and to the faculty member’s discipline. The exact level of service is primarily a departmental function and no specific level of service is mandated here (specific levels of Service are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.) Faculty members are expected to make useful, documented contributions to their department, their College, the University, and to their discipline.

Categories for Service The following are the potential categories for service and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly.

Tab D.1. Contributions to the department and/or interdisciplinary program: List memberships on departmental committees, development of programs, and activities. List only contributions not related to professional development or instruction.

Tab D.2. Committee Responsibilities at the College, University, or System Level: List committees and periods of service.

Tab D.3. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: List consultantships, memberships on advisory boards, and offices held, and include dates of service.

Tab D.4. Assistance to Colleagues: List official or unofficial mentorship of colleagues, consultation about educational problems, reviews of manuscripts, collaboration on research projects, and contributions to programs in other concentrations, departments, or schools.

Tab D.5. Significant Community Participation: List lectures, speeches, presentations, and short courses presented in the community and include dates.
Tab D.6. Meritorious Public Service: List assistance to governmental agencies and development of community, state, or national resources and include dates.

Tab D.7. Contributions to Professional Associations: List organizational offices held or contributions to professional organizations and include where appropriate dates of term, and method of selection (e.g., by appointment, by election).

VI Additional Evaluation Materials for Third Year Review of Faculty
Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the above items in Section V, as well as:

- Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two years,
- Student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two years and the fall semester of the current year, and
- Narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, scholarship and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

VII Instructions for the Provost’s Binder
B. A summative dossier should also be prepared to be forwarded to the Provost. The following materials should be submitted in a one inch binder clearly labeled with the faculty member’s name, department, and area of review. Do not use plastic sheet protectors. The documents required will be limited to the following in the exact order:

Section I
- Curriculum Vitae
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.

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

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

Section IV
- Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments 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 rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form.
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson.
- Written recommendation of the FCSM PTRM Committee.
- Written recommendation of the academic dean. [NOTE: For Section V, the FCSM PTRM Chairperson and the dean have responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations are included in the folder.]

The department should retain any other supportive materials and make them available if needed. These materials are not to be forwarded unless specifically requested. Binders that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the college.
VIII Instructions for the Comprehensive Five-Year Review

Sections I-IV of the Comprehensive Five-Year Review binders will be identical to those of Provosts P&T binders, as described above in VII. Instructions for the Provost's Binder, and will cover the five years under review. Section V Evaluations should only include the following:

- Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee,
- Letter of evaluation from department chairperson,
- Letter of evaluation from academic dean, and
- Peer teaching evaluations.
I. PREAMBLE

A. The basic statements of faculty requirements and expectations are established by the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents and are stated in the University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty and the University System of Maryland Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities. Towson University (TU) statements include the TU Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit and the TU Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities.

B. Separate committees in the Department of Biological Sciences are responsible for tenure, promotion and comprehensive review policy (P&T Committee) and for merit (Merit Committee).

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. The Merit Committee shall evaluate faculty for merit.

B. The Merit Committee shall evaluate existing policy and documents and make recommendations for change to the faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences.

III. MERIT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

A. Composition and Terms

1. The Departmental Merit Committee will be composed of seven full-time tenured faculty members and the Departmental Chair, who will serve as a non-voting member. At least three new individuals must be elected to the committee each year. Faculty will generally serve a two-year term, although some faculty may serve a one-year term if this is needed to allow for the election of three (3) new individuals any particular year. New terms begin immediately upon election of new committee members at the February meeting of faculty. After completing their term, faculty will be ineligible for election to the committee, if possible, for a period of two years.

B. Eligibility requirements

1. Ineligible faculty members include:

   a) those who have served on the committee within the previous two years
   b) those requesting to be considered for promotion during the subsequent academic year
   c) those whose current promotion decision is under appeal
   d) those who will be on sabbatical during the fall semester of the coming academic year
   e) those who are scheduled for comprehensive review during the year in which the committee is active
   f) the Tenure Committee chair in the upcoming fall semester
   g) lecturers

C. Selection

1. Election for members shall be by the tenured and tenure-track faculty and lecturers who were evaluated by the Committee the previous year. Prior to the election, the current committee chair will query faculty members eligible for election, asking if any individuals wish to identify themselves prior to the vote as individuals willing to serve on this committee.

2. One ballot listing the eligible faculty will be cast anonymously. Each faculty member will vote for as many individuals as are required to put seven individuals on the committee. Individuals receiving the most votes shall be selected.

3. If there is a tie among faculty for the final position, additional ballots listing only the tied eligible
faculty will be cast until clear winners are determined.

4. The committee secretary will keep a record of the number of votes received by each eligible faculty member. If at any time an elected committee member becomes ineligible or unavailable for service, they will be replaced by the individual receiving the next most number of votes in the previous election. In the event that two or more potential alternates have identical vote totals, individual(s) will be selected by coin flip or some other random procedure.

IV. GENERAL PROCEDURES

A. Election of Officers

1. Immediately following selection of the committee, the committee shall meet and elect a chair and a secretary. Co-chairs are permitted.

2. Election shall be by nominations from within the committee.

3. Nominees who accept nomination shall be elected upon a simple open, majority vote of the entire committee.

4. If no nominations occur, or no nominee accepts a nomination for either the committee chair or secretary position, the Departmental Chair shall be informed and s/he will appoint committee members to the open position(s).

B. Duties

1. Chair or Co-chairs of Merit Committee
   a. Ensure that the calendar, policies and procedures of the committee are followed.
   b. Schedule and preside over all meetings of the committee.
   c. Distribute materials describing evaluation procedure and documents required from faculty.
   d. Assign to committee members specific duties and responsibilities such as subcommittees and writing recommendations.
   e. Conduct, with the aid of the secretary, elections for the new committee.

2. Secretary of Merit Committee
   a. Maintain a record of all decisions of the committee.
   b. Collect and maintain evaluation portfolios (hereafter called a “dossier”) from each faculty member to be evaluated.
   c. Assist the committee chair in preparing and distributing the Report to Faculty Member on Performance and Merit to faculty regarding the outcome of deliberations.

C. Organization of meetings

1. Quorum
   a. Personnel decisions
   i) For deliberations of faculty dossiers and votes on Merit all voting members of the Merit Committee must be present. In the event of an immediate and unexpected emergency, one individual may be absent from a meeting if postponing the meeting makes it likely that the committee cannot complete its work by the required deadlines. If that individual is certain or likely to miss more than one meeting of the committee, they must be replaced by another individual following procedures described above.
   ii) Committee members will be absent when their own files are discussed, and a quorum
shall be the remaining members.

b. For deliberations of committee policies and procedures, a quorum shall be five of its members.

2. Voting

a. All votes shall be by secret ballot, dated and signed with the Towson University ID number of the voting committee member and tallied by the committee chair or designee (e.g., secretary). The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of final votes to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded to the Provost’s office as per University’s PTRM policies and procedures.

3. Confidentiality

a. All discussions and votes are confidential. Points of discussion and vote results will not be shared outside of the Committee.

D. Evaluation and Revision of Policies for Merit

1. Three Year Review

a. Every three years the Merit Committee will conduct a complete review of the merit policies with input from the faculty.

b. The document, whether or not revisions have been made, will be distributed to all tenured and tenure track faculty and lecturers who were evaluated by the Committee the previous year, at least ten (10) business days prior to the first Tuesday in December.

c. The document will be presented to faculty for discussion, revision, and approval by a simple majority vote at the December department meeting. With the exception of faculty who are on leave from the department, the signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member and lecturers who were evaluated by the Committee the previous year, on the Approval Form will signify that s/he has voted on the documents.

d. The revised policies will be submitted to the FCSM PTRM committee for approval.

e. The Committee may, in any year, call for specific revisions.

V. CALENDAR

A. February meeting of the faculty: Election of Merit Committee.

B. Second Friday in May: Annual Faculty Workload Expectations document (AFWEs) due to Departmental Chair for review.

C. Third Friday in June: Faculty merit dossiers due to Department Chair or designee(s). Faculty can request extension of deadline with justification (e.g., in the field conducting research), but must submit dossier no later than one week prior to the first day of fall semester classes.

D. Third Friday in September: Last day for faculty or chairperson to update dossiers regarding work done prior to June 1.

G. Second Friday in October: The committee submits merit evaluations to the departmental chair. The department chair may prepare an independent written evaluation of performance and recommendation for merit. All evaluations prepared by the department chair must be completed by the fourth Friday in October. Such evaluations will be added to the appropriate dossier(s) and a copy will be conveyed to the faculty member. The department chairperson places his/her independent evaluation into the appropriate dossier.
H. Fourth Friday in October:

1. The Merit Committee evaluation and any chairperson evaluations are given to all faculty. Negative recommendations (i.e., performance over the previous year deemed Not Meritorious) shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address. Faculty members have 21 days to appeal decisions to the College P & T Committee (see below).

I. Second Friday in November: The faculty member’s dossier, inclusive of evaluations and records of vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are delivered to the college.

J. 30 November: Final date for faculty to add material to “Information Added” section of their dossier (purpose of this special section is described below).

K. Before the first day of the spring semester: The department chairperson shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the faculty member’s annual report, any student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the department’s merit recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

VI. MERIT REVIEW

A. Faculty will submit to Departmental Chairperson or designee the following documents, which form the evaluation portfolio or dossier. Documents should appear in the order shown and be placed in a single 3-ring binder.

1. Annual Faculty Workload Expectation agreement (AFWE) for the academic year under review.

2. Faculty Annual Report (FAR; see Appendices A and B-1 and B-2 for requirements and guidelines). The FAR will contain the AFWE for the coming year.

3. Narrative summary of activity and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The narrative summary is limited to two single spaced pages using a 12 point font.

4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.

5. Syllabi from all courses taught, which include desired learning outcomes.

6. Quantitative evaluation summaries.

7. Qualitative evaluations for all courses in which such evaluations are used/required.

8. Grade distributions for all courses in the form of a frequency histogram, including W grades. Faculty may also provide known or suspected reasons for unusual grade distributions.

9. Supporting/corroborating documentation (dated, where appropriate) for accomplishments and activities listed in the FAR. This should include copies of any peer evaluations completed during the year in review.

B. Faculty will submit to the Merit Committee secretary an electronic version of their narrative summary.
C. Procedure

1. All members of the Merit Committee will review, independently, each faculty member's merit dossier. The effort as well as the accomplishments and effectiveness (hereafter referred to collectively as "performance") of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, service and scholarship will be discussed. One individual, selected in advance by the committee chair, will serve as the "lead" and will begin the discussion by providing the committee with an overview of the record of the faculty member under review. This person will then lead the discussion. To the extent possible, leads will be individuals from the same department area as the faculty member under review.

2. Following the discussion the faculty member's effort and performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service will be rated as follows:

   UNSATISFACTORY: Does not meet minimum expectations (used especially when performance or lack thereof is detrimental to the institution and/or its students).

   ACCEPTABLE: Meets minimum/basic expectations satisfactorily.

   COMMENDABLE: Performance is noteworthy and goes beyond basic expectations.

   SUPERIOR: Superior performance, that which is truly outstanding.

3. Each committee member will relay their ratings in a closed ballot to the committee secretary who will tally and report the results. If the vote does not result in a consensus of at least five committee members as to the level of effort/performance (i.e., category above), discussion and voting will continue until such 5/7 consensus is reached (4/6 if a merit committee member is being considered).

4. Following the guidelines below, a second vote will then be taken to determine whether an individual is meritorious and, if so, at what level.

   Not meritorious: Any unsatisfactory rating will result automatically in a merit ranking of "not meritorious." Likewise, if no rating exceeds acceptable in any of the three areas, the resulting merit ranking will be "not meritorious."

   Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Superior in at least one area and Commendable in remaining area(s).

   Satisfactory (Base Merit): All other contingencies.

The above are guidelines. Each committee member will, in a closed ballot, indicate to the committee secretary which of the above three categorizations they feel is appropriate for the person under evaluation. The secretary will tally and report the results. If the vote does not result in a consensus of at least five committee members as to category, discussion and voting will continue until such 5/7 consensus is reached (4/6 if a merit committee member is being considered).

5. Any committee member may call for further discussion of any aspect of a faculty member's effort and performance at any time prior to the second Friday in October, when evaluation reports are due to the chair. In general, reconsiderations will be conducted after the initial review of all faculty has been completed, especially when substantial additional discussion is anticipated.
6. The chair and/or secretary of the Merit Committee will provide each faculty member with a “Report to Faculty Member on Performance and Merit” (Appendix C; also known as the “FCSM Merit Form”) which summarizes the Committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in each area, and indicates the level of merit for which the faculty member will be recommended. Vote totals for the latter will also be reported. This report will also contain a written summary of why the faculty member was evaluated as shown. The report will be detailed, stating specifically what aspects of the faculty member’s activities qualified him/her for the ranking. Evaluations of “Not Meritorious” shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

7. Reports to Faculty are to be signed by faculty members and returned to the Merit Committee secretary or designee. The faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read, but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation. However, failure to sign shall not prevent the documentation from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.

D. Challenges, Rebuttals and Appeals

1. Faculty should immediately inform the Merit Committee chair if their evaluation contains factual inaccuracies (e.g., incorrect quantitative evaluation scores, incorrect identification of paper/grant status, incorrect counts of number of students supervised in research, etc.) or omissions (i.e., substantial and important activity or accomplishments not mentioned). After checking the dossier to confirm, the committee chair can make the requested minor revisions to the evaluation and provide the revised copy to the faculty member.

2. In the event that a faculty member wishes to challenge or rebut the final committee recommendation and/or any written administrator evaluation, s/he may add to the file any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective of his/her performance. This information must be included in the dossier in a special section entitled “Information Added,” and must be included in the dossier by 30 November. If faculty members choose to add material to their dossier after the date on which dossiers are delivered to the College, faculty must contact the College directly to determine when and how to add said material. Regardless of when material is added to the dossier, the faculty member must inform the Departmental Chair that material is being added to provide a brief description (or copy) of this material.

3. If the faculty member feels that that his/her ranking of performance in one or more areas (teaching, scholarship, service) is unjustified because either: 1) an error in judgment was made by the committee; 2) a procedural error was made, or 3) they are being discriminated against on the basis of race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability, they can appeal the committee’s evaluation. As per University policy, appeals are made directly to the college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee and must be made within 21 days of receipt of the evaluation. Faculty should consult both University and College guidelines for further instructions on making an appeal.

D. Evaluation of first-year faculty (Sections VI A-C above pertain only to non-first year faculty).

1. First-year faculty are not eligible for merit until their second year at TU, i.e. after completing at least one semester of teaching.
APPENDIX A-1: REQUIREMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF Dossiers TO BE USED IN EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE FOR MERIT

University policy requires that, at a minimum, dossiers contain the following:

- completed and signed Annual Report Parts I & II or Chairperson’s Annual Report I & II (details on required content and format of the Annual Report are found in Appendices A-2 and A-3)
- current curriculum vitae
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
  - student evaluations;
  - grade distributions for courses;
- documentation of scholarship and service for the year under review.

The department further requires, at a minimum, that faculty include: 1) Annual Report, Part II for the year in question, 2) a narrative summary statement (see Appendix A-4 for description), and 3) copies of representative examinations from all courses taught during the year in review.

As a further guide to what to include in the dossier, especially as regards reporting on: 1) efforts and activity to improve teaching and learning, 2) scholarly activity, and 3) service activity, faculty should see Appendix B.

Notes:

- The “year under review” is the “previous academic year” which started 1 June of the previous year and ended on 31 May of the current year. Dossiers are due to the Merit Committee on the third Friday in June. As indicated above, faculty can request extension of deadline, but must submit the dossier no later than one week prior to the first day of fall semester classes.
- After submitting their dossier, a faculty member may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to 2 June of the current year that has only become available after the dossier was submitted. However, all such additions must be made no later than the third Friday in September. Faculty members must inform the Merit Committee chair in writing that additions to the dossier are being made and describe those additions in detail.
- Additional material related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has become available after the deadline for submission of the portfolio or dossier may also be added by the chairperson. If such material is added, the faculty member must be notified immediately and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. If the faculty member is not notified within five (5) business days, the material will be removed from the portfolio or dossier.

Special Instructions for Chairpersons and Program Directors

When describing activities in the area of service, chairpersons and program directors must clearly indicate which activities are normally expected for the person in their position and which, if any, activities go above and beyond these expectations. Chairpersons and program directors should not expect the committee to scrutinize the Annual Faculty Workload Agreement to make this judgment themselves.
Chairpersons and program directors should also indicate their expectations (agreed to with the Dean) with regards to both teaching load and amount/nature of scholarship so that the committee can better discern the level of effort and performance in these areas.
APPENDIX A-2. REQUIRED FORMAT OF THE FACULTY ANNUAL REPORT

Note: Material in italics is instructive only and should not be included in the final report.
Note: Material in italics is advisory. Faculty may decide to include specific items under categories other than those indicated in italics. If a faculty member chooses to do so, they should list those exceptions in their narrative summary and explain the rationale for those exceptions. In any case, each contribution should be recorded in only one category.

ANNUAL REPORT (AR)
Part I
Reporting On Activities For Academic Year
June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

Name ___________________________ Rank ___________________________
Department of ___________________________
Area of Specialization ___________________________
Appointed to TU faculty: at rank ___________ in year ________.

Promotion History:
To rank ___________________________ in year ________,
To rank ___________________________ in year ________, and
To rank ___________________________ in year ________.

I. Formal Degrees
A. Highest degree earned, with date and name of granting institution. If received since June 1 of reporting year, attach proof.
B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1 of reporting year and present status. Corroborative material and/or transcript must be attached.

II. Teaching (percentage of workload: ___
A. Regular classroom teaching assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title/Number</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>No. enrolled/ no. evaluating</th>
<th>Mean quantitative score on evaluations</th>
<th>Onload/Offload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Amount/nature of assigned non-teaching time (non-classroom assignments that are part of or replace on-load teaching assignment (e.g., directorships, supervision of student teachers).

C. Efforts to update courses, new instructional procedures, specialty courses, special projects, etc.
In this subsection, faculty members should describe briefly and systematically efforts made to improve the quality of their courses and their teaching. This would include but is not limited to: 1) efforts to keep course material up-to-date; 2) creation of new lectures, laboratories, and other activities; 3) implementation of new teaching techniques; 4) documented efforts to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of certain teaching techniques or of the course itself; 5) participation in workshops and like events to enhance one’s teaching effectiveness; 6) preparation of, awarding of, and/or implementation of grant proposals to develop and improve teaching and courses; and 7) involvement in specialty one-on-one courses such as Directed Readings and Independent Study. See also Appendix B below.

D. Advising (approximate number of students advised in any venue in each semester)
   1. Part of regular duties
   2. Compensated off-load duties

E. Supervision of student research
   1. Undergraduates
   2. Graduate students

F. Non-Research External Grants and Contracts Related to Teaching
   1. Proposals submitted
   2. New Awards
   3. Ongoing administration of previous awards

G. Non-Research Internal Grants and Contracts Related to Teaching
   1. Proposals submitted
   2. New Awards
   3. Ongoing administration of previous awards.

Correlation Statement. If teaching efforts/performance did not match projections for reporting year, explain.

III. Scholarship (percentage of workload: ___%)

Faculty must organize this section using the following headings and subheadings as appropriate.

A. Submissions and Publications
   • Submission of new or revised peer-reviewed work
   • Peer-reviewed work accepted or published in reporting year
   • Non-peer-reviewed publications
• Non-peer-reviewed abstracts

B. Presentations

• External meetings/conferences
• Internal meetings/conferences

C. External Grants and Contracts

• Proposals submitted
• New awards
• Ongoing administration of previous awards

D. Internal Grants and Contracts

• Proposals submitted
• New awards

E. Workshops conducted within the discipline.

F. Other products of scholarship effort

G. Summary of ongoing scholarly activity

Correlation Statement. If productivity did not match projections for reporting year, please explain.

IV. Service (percentage of workload: ___%)

A. Service to the University

B. Service to the College

C. Service to the Department

D. Service to the Community

E. Service to the Discipline

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for the reporting year, please explain.

Faculty Member ________________________________ Date ________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chairperson of Department</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of College</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****************************************************************************************************

******
Part II
Agreement On Faculty Workload Expectations For Academic Year
June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

I. Teaching (percentage of workload:  %)

A. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the academic year in question.

B. Non-classroom assignments that will be part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., directorships, supervision of student teachers) for the academic year in question.

C. New instructional procedures that you plan to introduce this year (special projects, new courses and/or materials). Also include interdisciplinary, diversity, international and new technology projects, if appropriate.

D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

E. Supervision of student research

II. Scholarship (percentage of workload: %)

III. Service (percentage of workload: %)
(Indicate any activities that are part of workload or for which additional payment is received)

A. Service to the University

B. Service to the College

C. Service to the Department

D. Service to the Community

E. Service to the Discipline

Faculty Member ___________________________________________ Date ______________
Chairperson of Department _________________________________ Date ______________
Dean of College __________________________________________ Date ______________
APPENDIX A-3: SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTAL AND COLLEGE REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORTING SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY ON PART 1 OF THE FAR

Work submitted for publication

Faculty should identify student co-authors, e.g., * = TU undergraduate, ** = TU graduate student

Faculty should indicate names of authors as they appear on the submission, the title of the submission, the date of submission (month/year), and the publication to which the work was submitted. If the work was submitted previously (e.g., to a different publication) and this was indicated on a previous FAR, faculty members should note this. Examples follow.


*Murphy, S.M., L. Smith, A. Glenn, J. Watson. Effect of commonly used foraging enrichment on stereotypic behavior in rhesus macaques. Submitted to Laboratory Animal Science in September, 2010. (Earlier version of the paper was reported as submitted to a different journal on previous year’s FAR).

Work accepted or published

Faculty should identify student co-authors as described above. Citations should be in standard format, providing names of authors as they appear on the paper, date of acceptance or year of publication, paper title, journal name, volume and page numbers. If the paper had been reported as submitted or accepted on the previous year’s FAR, this must be indicated. Examples follow:

Jones, N., and J.L. Redford*. In press. Evidence for a maternal effect benefiting offspring in rattlesnakes. Accepted for publication in Journal of Reptile Biology, January 2011. (Reported as submitted on previous year’s FAR).


Presentations at meetings/conferences

Faculty should indicate authors on the presentation (identifying TU undergraduate and graduate students as shown above), the actual presenter (underline the individual's name), the name of meeting/conference and/or sponsoring organization, and the date (month/year) and location of the conference. Faculty should also indicate the type of presentation given (e.g., poster versus oral presentation versus workshop). An example follows:


Grants and contracts

Only grants and contracts on which the faculty member is a PI or co-PI should be reported in the Scholarship section. Grants on which students are the sole PI (e.g., internal undergraduate research grants, Sigma Xi grants etc.) should be reported under the Supervision of Student Research subsection of the Teaching section.
For proposals submitted during the reporting year, faculty should identify the principal investigators and co-principal investigators, the funding office or institution, the amount of funding requested, and the date of submission.

For proposals awarded during the reporting year, faculty should identify the principal investigators and co-principal investigators, the funding office or institution, the amount of funding received, and the date of notification. When the date of notification and the date that funding actually begins occurring different reporting years, faculty have the option of reporting the awarding of funds in either year, but should not do so in both.

For grants being administered during the reporting year, faculty should identify the principal investigators and co-principal investigators, funding office or institution, the amount of funding received, and the date that funding began. Faculty should also briefly describe their role in administering the grant.

************************************************************************************************************************

**APPENDIX A-4: THE NARRATIVE SUMMARY**

Faculty must attach to their Faculty Annual Report a one to two page narrative summary that describes their key activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and research. An electronic version of this summary must also be sent to the Merit Committee secretary.

The Narrative Summary can serve several important functions:

1. It will ensure that the committee does not overlook key activities and accomplishments, which can and does happen on occasion, especially when dossiers are prepared and organized in certain ways.

2. It will draw the committee’s attention to what the faculty member feels are their most noteworthy activities and accomplishments.

3. It gives the faculty member a chance to respond directly to concerns raised by the committee in the previous year’s merit evaluation, explaining efforts/success in responding to those concerns.

4. It will greatly assist the committee in preparing the written merit evaluation that is complete and accurate.

5. It will assist faculty up for tenure, promotion and comprehensive review in preparing required multi-year narrative summaries.

Faculty uncertain as to the content and structure of the summary should contact the Merit Committee chair for recommendations as to which experienced faculty can provide examples of well-prepared summaries.
APPENDIX B: DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATION FOR MERIT

When evaluating a faculty member’s activity, accomplishments, and effectiveness (hereafter collectively referred to as “performance”), items that the Merit Committee will consider during evaluation are listed below. Faculty should use these lists as guides as to what to include in their formal Faculty Annual Report (FAR) and/or their dossier. Note that these lists are not exhaustive. It is each faculty member’s responsibility to describe and document fully their activities and accomplishments, including items that they feel are appropriate but are not included below. Underreporting may lead to a lower evaluation of performance than expected or desired and cannot be used as grounds for an appeal.

Teaching

Included in the evaluation of performance in the area of teaching are the following: (note: order shown does not necessarily indicate order of importance):

1. The number and nature of courses taught, especially courses taught for the first time (the committee acknowledges that teaching a course for the first time requires considerable time and effort)
2. Quantitative student evaluation scores
3. Qualitative student evaluations
4. Any peer-teaching evaluation(s)
5. Documented efforts to keep course material updated
6. Documented efforts to improve the quality of the course such as creation of new laboratories, instituting new teaching techniques, etc.
7. Documented efforts to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of certain teaching techniques or of the course itself, e.g., as preparation for more advanced courses.
   Note: Presentations of findings at internal or external conferences, as well as publications of results in teaching journals should be listed as Scholarship.
8. Nature of examinations, with particular attention paid to the degree to which examinations test not only factual recall but also critical thinking skills including student’s ability to apply knowledge to novel situations.
9. Grade distributions and appropriateness given the level and nature of course, and nature of examinations.
10. Participation in workshops and like events to enhance one’s teaching effectiveness.
11. The preparation of, awarding of, and/or implementation of grant proposals to develop and improve teaching and courses (Faculty, especially those whose area of scholarship is focused on education, may instead list such efforts under Scholarship.)
12. Standard and off-load advising of undergraduates and non-thesis graduate students in choice of coursework, career options, etc. (Note: Off-load, paid advising, e.g., FYE program advising, should be indicated and will considered in addition to “regular” effort in the area of teaching.)
13. Involvement in specialty one-on-one courses such as Directed Readings and Independent Study
14. Supervision of student research, including undergraduate and graduate students
15. Internal and external grants and awards received by students (such grants can be additionally reported under Scholarship).

Notes:

- Faculty who supervise students in research should describe their efforts in some detail. This should be done in a subsection (E), of Section II of the Faculty Annual Report.

- Activities such as pedagogical research, participation in teaching workshops, and extensive, quality efforts to supervise students in research can help faculty earn a Commendable or Superior rating in the area of Teaching. However, such activities will not compensate for poor performance in the classroom.

- To be rated higher than Acceptable in the area of Teaching, individuals must do more than simply teach their courses and earn reasonable or even high marks on quantitative and qualitative student evaluations. Effort beyond this of some type is required. At the very least, faculty must demonstrate a concerted effort to keep their courses up to date.

Scholarship

As per University policy and definitions, Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration and/or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field.

Scholarship of Application – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university.

Scholarship of Discovery – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.

Scholarship of Integration – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.

Scholarship of Teaching – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between a teacher’s understanding and student learning.

Included in the evaluation of performance in the area of Scholarship are the following:

1. Submissions of new or revised work to peer-reviewed journals
2. Acceptance or publication of work in peer-reviewed journals
3. Submissions, acceptance, or publication of work in non-peer-reviewed publications
4. Publication of scholarly books, including textbooks
5. Presentations by self and/or student researchers at external meetings/conferences
6. Presentations by self and/or student researchers at internal meetings/conferences
7. Submission of proposals for new grants or contracts
8. New external or internal grants or contracts awarded during the reporting year

9. Ongoing administration of research grant/contracts awarded during previous years

10. Ongoing research and other scholarly activities

Notes:

- Any detailed descriptions of supervision of the research of undergraduates and graduate students should be listed under subsection E. in the section on teaching. Products/outcomes of such supervision including presentations and publications should be listed under Scholarly activity.

- Faculty must review activities and accomplishments listed in the prior year’s FAR and avoid reporting activities and accomplishments identically in the current year. This is discussed further in Appendix B.

**Service**

“Service” is broadly defined to include participation in the governing and administrative activities of the [Department, College, or University](#). It also includes service to larger [community](#) outside the University if such service draws upon the faculty member’s discipline or interdisciplinary specialty or furthers the [University mission](#). Finally, this includes service to one’s [profession](#).

Included in the evaluation of performance in the area of Service are the following:

**Service to the institution**, which includes but is not limited to:

- Contributions to the governance of the Department, College and University in the form of committees, administrative assignments, or other duties

- Administration of REU or similar non-investigative grants for Department, College, and/or University not previously listed under “Teaching”.

- Representation of the Department, College or University at State or System levels

- Guidance of student organizations

**Service to practitioners and community**, which includes but is not limited to assisting the community at large in the area of expertise of the faculty member. Examples may include participation in workshops related to the profession, presentations and lectures to schools or community groups, professional consultation, advising of groups, publication in newspapers and other non-scientific venues.

**Service to the profession**, which includes but is not limited to:

- Contribution to professional societies (local, regional or national)

- Reviews of papers, books, films, and software

- Grant reviews and grant review panels

- Editorial positions and professional reviews of manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals
• Assessment of individuals, programs for other academic or research institutions

**Percentage of Workload Considerations**

In evaluating effort in performance in any area, and overall performance, the committee will also take into consideration the proportion of their time faculty members had proposed to devote to an area, as stated on their AFWE. For example, a person who indicates that they will devote 80% of time to teaching, 15% to service and 5% to scholarship, will, in the eyes of the committee have greater expectations in the area of teaching than in the areas of service and scholarship when compared to say a person who proposes to spend 65%, 5%, and 30% of their time on teaching, service and scholarship.
APPENDIX C: STRUCTURE OF REPORT TO FACULTY MEMBER ON PERFORMANCE AND MERIT

REPORT TO FACULTY MEMBER ON PERFORMANCE AND MERIT

Faculty member's name:

Academic year evaluated:

A majority of Merit Committee members evaluated your levels of performance as follows:

Teaching:  ___Superior   ___Commendable   ___Acceptable     ___Unacceptable

Scholarship: ___Superior   ___Commendable   ___Acceptable  ___Unacceptable

Service:  ___Superior   ___Commendable   ___Acceptable  ___Unacceptable

A majority of Merit Committee recommends you for the following category level of merit:

The number of votes that you received regarding merit were as follows:

Not meritorious:  Satisfactory: (Base Merit):  Excellent (Base merit plus one Performance Merit):

Rationale/comments:

Teaching:

Scholarship:

Service:

Signed ____________________  ____________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Merit Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES PEER TEACHING EVALUATION

To: Merit/Tenure Committee

From: Evaluation Subcommittee for evaluation of:

Submitted by:

Date:

Course in which the faculty member was observed (no. and name):

Date of Observation:

Content:

Methodology:

Interaction with students

Additional Materials Evaluated (Syllabus, tests, etc.)

Summary of general performance:

The above statement is an accurate summary of our evaluation:

Signature of each subcommittee member:
APPENDIX E: TENATIVE SCHEDULE OF FIVE YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS OF DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES’ FACULTY

2011  Gresens  Haines  Margulies
2012  Snodgrass  Silldorff  Johnson  Wimmers
2013  Robinson  Scully  Roberts  Wolfson
2014  Nelson  Seigel  Saunders
2015  Fath  Winters  LaPolla  Shepard  Beck
2016  Masters  Shields  Gresens  Margulies  Haines
2017  Snyder  Johnson  Silldorff  Snodgrass  Wimmers
2018  Vaidya  Beauchamp  Ghent  Bulmer

Note: Teaching observations required for the comprehensive review will be completed in the spring semester of the year show.