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POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE

For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) Policy of Towson University and its appendices, as well as the College of Liberal Arts PTRM guidelines.

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE

All faculty members with tenure in the History Department will be members of the PTRM Committee. In May, after the election of the History representative to the CLA PTRM Committee and the final announcement from the Provost on promotion and tenure, the History PTRM Committee for the next academic year will be formed. Subcommittees will be created as detailed below.

II. POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE PTRM COMMITTEE CHAIR, HISTORY DEPARTMENT CHAIR, AND THE PTRM COMMITTEE

A. The Chair of the History PTRM Committee shall be the person elected to the CLA PTRM Committee for a three-year term during the spring semester. The CLA procedures for the selection of the History representative to the CLA PTRM Committee, and his or her term in that position, will thus determine the selection of the History PTRM Committee Chair. The Chair’s duties include calling and managing meetings, ensuring that personnel decisions are made according to the process outlined in this document, overseeing the efforts of subcommittees, writing letters of recommendation, assisting faculty in the creation of their tenure or promotion files, and other duties as necessary. Whenever the History PTRM Committee Chair excuses him/herself from deliberations on his/her own materials or is unable to attend a meeting, the senior member of the remaining Committee shall serve as chair. If the History PTRM Chair is unable to serve because of a sabbatical leave, faculty exchange, promotion consideration, or for any other reason, the college electorate shall choose a replacement before the college PTRM committee begins its work.

At the first formal meeting of the History PTRM Committee each academic year the Committee will vote for a secretary. The secretary will be obliged to serve for only one academic year.

The History Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the PTRM Committee and shall participate in all deliberations regardless of her/his academic rank, except for deliberations on her/his own dossier. As detailed in the ART and the CLA PTRM documents, the History Chair prepares an independent recommendation in each case and includes these recommendations and those of the Committee in candidate files before transmitting them to the CLA PTRM Committee. The History Chair shall maintain a copy of all official documents.
concerning evaluation recommendations. The History Chair is not required to
write letters regarding annual merit determinations.

The History PTRM Committee and its subcommittees make recommendations on
promotion to Associate Professor, on the granting or denial of tenure, and on
reappointment. The History PTRM Committee and its subcommittees evaluate
candidates in relation to the standards and expectations established for faculty in
the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts,
and the criteria of the History Department. The History PTRM Committee and its
subcommittee will produce a concise but detailed statement in support of its
recommendation with reference to each category evaluated, including
teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. No
member of the History PTRM Committee or its subcommittees will participate in
deliberations or vote on his or her dossier.

For consideration of cases of tenure and reappointment the PTRM meets as a
whole.

For consideration of cases of promotion to full professor and for Five Year
Comprehensive Reviews, a separate Professor Subcommittee will be created.
This subcommittee will consist of full professors, who will participate in
deliberations and vote. In these cases, a quorum will be a majority of the full
professors in the Department, excepting the History Chair and faculty on leave or
sabbatical.

For recommendations on merit a Merit Subcommittee of the PTRM committee
will be created. See Section O below for membership and duties.

If the History PTRM Committee or its subcommittees reviews materials that have
been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the
review process consistent with the guidelines for such actions in University
policy, the Committee will note that it has done so in its recommendation.

B. Quorum

A quorum will consist of a majority of the voting members of the History PTRM
Committee, excluding faculty members on leave or on sabbatical, and the History
Chair. If fewer than three tenured faculty members (excluding the History Chair)
are available to serve on the History PTRM Committee, the PTRM process will
be modified in accordance with the ART and the CLA PTRM document. The
Merit Subcommittee requires five voting members for a quorum as detailed in O
below.

C. Voting Procedures
All votes shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate in accordance with ART policy (ART III A.5). Votes shall be tallied by the History PTRM Chair. The History PTRM Chair will forward to the History Chair a signed, dated report of the results of the vote along with the text of the motion voted upon. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded under separate cover to the History Chair for submission to the CLA Dean.

Faculty members on leave or sabbatical may vote if they review the materials as required and attend the History PTRM Committee meetings. Even if faculty members cannot participate, they will be informed of all meetings and the results of those meetings. However, they will only be able to comment upon draft letters or recommendations from the History PTRM Committee if they attend the meeting where those decisions were reached.

A majority of those voting must support the granting of tenure or promotion for the committee to reach a favorable recommendation. Because a tie vote does not constitute a majority decision, any proposal met with a tie vote fails. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for reappointment, third-year review, five-year comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. Votes on procedural matters may be made by a show of hands, and abstentions are permitted.

**D. Confidentiality**

Members of the History PTRM committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the History PTRM Committee Chair, History Chair, or CLA Dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

**E. Notification of Candidates of Decisions**

The History PTRM Committee recommendation and a record of the vote count shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the History PTRM Chair and submitted to the History Chair as defined by the schedule in Appendix A below. Faculty members will receive the recommendation and a record of the vote count according to the schedule in Appendix A below. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing or in person by the History PTRM Chair or sent by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to the faculty member's last known address. Reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, tenure, and merit recommendations shall be addressed to the Chair. Third year review recommendations shall be addressed to the faculty member. Five-year review letters must explicitly address the person's status toward attaining the requirements for promotion. The candidate is encouraged to seek
mentorship from colleagues on the Five-Year Review Committee regarding the path to promotion.

Record of the faculty member’s notification of PTRM decisions and of letters related to the faculty member’s reappointment, third-year review, five-year comprehensive review, promotion, or tenure shall be tracked via the PTRM Document Review Transmittal Form (if available) or by the faculty member’s signature.

F. Publication of Decisions

Other than meeting the reporting requirements of this document, the CLA PTRM guidelines and the ART, recommendations of the History PTRM Committee are not publicized.

G. Appeal Procedures

All appeals of History PTRM Committee decisions will follow the College PTRM guidelines and section V of Appendix 3 of the ART.

H. Review of the History PTRM Document

Every three years after the first approval of this History PTRM policies and procedures document, the History PTRM committee will review this document and submit evidence of this review to the dean and to the UPTRM committee. This review, and any required changes, will be submitted in compliance with the calendar in Appendix A.

I. Changes in Policies

Changes to this document can be initiated by a majority vote of the History PTRM Committee. All History tenure and tenure-track faculty will vote on the proposed changes. Votes to accept or to change this document will be by confidential ballot. Other procedural votes may be by show of hands.

All policies and procedures in this document shall remain in effect until changed in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy, including approval by the college PTRM committee, approval by the dean, and approval by the UPTRM. Faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they were first appointed to a tenure-track position. All changes will be submitted in compliance with the schedule in Appendix A.

J. Annual Report
The secretary will submit an annual report to the History PTRM Chair and to the
History Chair for their review and, after any corrections or adjustments are made,
will submit copies of the final report to the History PTRM Chair and the History
Chair. The confidential annual report should summarize all actions taken by the
committee during the year. It should not identify faculty by name in reporting
negative recommendations or actions on appeals.

K. Promotion and Tenure

Procedures for promotion and tenure decisions will follow the guidelines of
Appendix 3, section III, of the ART and the CLA PTRM document. Candidates
for promotion and/or tenure should compile their materials as detailed in section
IV of this document in order to meet the standards in section V. The schedule for
this effort and the History and CLA PTRM evaluations is detailed in Appendix A.
After individually reviewing the materials and discussing the candidate’s record
in the History PTRM Committee meeting, the Committee will vote to support or
not support the promotion and/or tenure file. The Committee will document its
findings and vote as detailed in this section. For cases of promotion to full
professor, however, a subcommittee of full professors will review the files and
vote.

L. Third Year Review Procedures

The Third Year Review procedures will follow the guidelines of Appendix 3,
section III, of the ART and the CLA PTRM document utilizing the materials
detailed in section IV and the standards set forth in section V below.

If a faculty member was hired on an accelerated tenure-track timetable resulting
from an agreement between faculty and dean or provost, this timetable shall
supersede the third year review. In those instances, the regular Annual Review by
the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the
History PTRM Committee may provide written feedback upon the request of the
candidate.

M. Five Year Comprehensive Review Procedures

The Comprehensive Review procedures will follow the guidelines of the ART
and CLA PTRM documents utilizing the materials detailed in section IV and the
standards set forth in section V below.

N. Reappointment

Reappointment of First Year, Second Year, and Third-Fifth Year Faculty will
follow the guidelines in the ART and the CLA PTRM documents utilizing the
materials detailed in section IV and the standards set forth in section V below.
The History PTRM Committee will also review folders from lecturers and visiting assistant professors who serve more than one year. The instructions for those folders are in section IV and standards for evaluation are in section V. These deliberations will take place during the reappointment meeting for tenure track faculty each fall. The History PTRM Chair will write a recommendation along the lines of those for tenure track faculty which will focus exclusively on teaching. The timing and distribution of those recommendations will be the same as for tenure track faculty.

O. Merit

For the purpose of awarding merit a subcommittee, ‘The Merit Subcommittee,’ will be selected through an election held no later than the first Friday in May. The Merit Subcommittee shall consist of five voting members (including the PTRM Chair) plus an alternate. All members of the Merit Subcommittee must be full-time tenured faculty. The Department Chairperson serves on the Merit Subcommittee in an ex officio capacity and does not vote. If possible, at least one of the voting members should be an Associate Professor and one should be a Full Professor. One alternate member shall be elected to this subcommittee, and this person will vote when a voting member of the subcommittee is absent or when the member’s own merit is being discussed and voted upon. All votes require five members of the subcommittee to cast ballots. No member may abstain from a vote. Motions require a majority vote to be passed. Members (other than the Department PTRM Chair) who have been elected to serve for two consecutive terms must wait at least one year before being re-elected to this committee, unless there are no other eligible members. Members who are on leave or otherwise are not on campus to fulfill their duties for the full academic year are not eligible to serve on this committee in that year. Faculty in their terminal year are not eligible to serve on the committee. The results of the Merit Subcommittee’s decisions will be disseminated to all tenure-track and tenured faculty.

1. Election of the Merit Subcommittee. By the second Friday in April the Chair of the PTRM Committee shall solicit self-nominations for election to the Merit Subcommittee for the academic year and shall try to ensure the nomination of at least one associate professor and one full professor. If five tenured faculty members do not volunteer the PTRM Committee Chair will name the members.

2. By the first Friday in May will vote for the Merit Subcommittee according to confidential ballots. The Chair of the PTRM Committee will tabulate the votes. The four individuals who receive the most votes will be named as voting members, the individual who receives the fifth highest number of votes will be the alternate. In case of tie votes the Chair of the PTRM
Committee will name members according to those who have not served on the committee most recently.

3. Merit Subcommittee members will review the annual reports for the previous academic year, then vote by confidential ballot to create a list of recommendations on not meritorious, satisfactory, and excellent merit. Merit determination will be based on accomplishments during the one year covered by the annual report and the criterion detailed in section V to reach its decisions. Current rank is not a criterion for merit determinations. At least one person outstanding in each category will be recommended for excellent merit: teaching, scholarship, and service. All tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible to be considered for merit. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible for excellent merit unless they were on leave or sabbatical for two semesters of the annual report under review. The Subcommittee may select one or more of its own members for excellent merit provided that member is not involved in discussions or voting on their merit recommendation. If a pool of merit funds is available for lecturers, they will be included in this effort. Members of the Merit Subcommittee will write all merit letters.

4. The Chair of the PTRM committee will serve as the Chair of the Merit Subcommittee with the following responsibilities in addition to those in #1 and #2 above:
   a. To call and conduct meetings of the Merit Subcommittee.
   b. To give formal written notice of merit to the department chairperson to be passed on to the individuals concerned and to the proper College and University authorities and committees.
   c. To tabulate votes and to run the meeting.
   d. To assign members of the Merit Subcommittee to write Merit Recommendation letters addressed to the History Department Chair except for the Chair’s own letter which is addressed to the Dean.
   e. To sign all merit letters.
   f. To lead a discussion of the Department Chair’s performance each year prior to the Merit Subcommittee meeting devoted to merit. This discussion should occur either during a regular faculty meeting or the History PTRM Chair shall invite junior faculty to participate in part of a PTRM meeting, though they cannot vote on merit. Only after receiving input from tenure track faculty will the History Merit Committee make any determinations on merit of the History Department Chair. The History PTRM Chair will draft a letter for the CLA Dean with
recommendations for not meritorious, satisfactory (base merit), or excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit). A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the History Chair.

5. Whenever the PTRM Chair is absent, the most senior member of the remaining committee serves in his or her place.

P. Letter Signing Procedures

The History Department PTRM Chair is responsible for assigning PTRM members to write all Tenure, Promotion, Merit, Reappointment, and Five-Year Review letters. These letters will be signed by the History PTRM Chair (on behalf of the committee) and by the faculty member to whom the letter applies. If a faculty member discovers a grammatical or factual error both the History Department PTRM Chair and the History Department Chair should be immediately notified and it will be their responsibility to correct the mistake if warranted.

III. EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE

The History PTRM Committee will follow the procedures described in Section III of the CLA PTRM document.

IV. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.

B. Guided by the History Chair, the History PTRM Chair, and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions in his or her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

C. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for the annual review process (which includes the Annual Review, reappointment, third-year review, merit consideration, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role and expectations of faculty in the university, as well as the faculty member’s college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. The portfolio requirements are detailed below.

1. Large items, such as books that cannot be secured in a binder, may be submitted separately. If there is more than one such item for a
faculty member, all such items pertaining to that faculty member should be enclosed in a manila envelope or a box of suitable size and the envelope or box labeled with the name of the faculty member and a list of its contents. All such items submitted shall be considered part of the evaluation portfolio.

2. Faculty who wish to submit work created digitally as part of their portfolio should, whenever possible, include in their file in printed form all of the work product or substantial examples conveying its substance and quality. Digital addresses of web pages, blogs, sites, or other locations may be included but there can be no expectation that reviewers will visit these sites as a required part of the process. Materials that cannot be printed, such as films, may be included on a DVD in the portfolio within a protective binder sleeve or as an accompanying item comparable to books as above.

D. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio if the University creates an approved format for doing so). Binders should be organized using dividers with tabs to identify the sections (electronic portfolios should be organized with similar clarity, based on University standards once developed and using the technologies available). Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. As detailed in the ART, Appendix B, section IB, contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
   a. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson’s Annual Report I & II) forms.
   b. current curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae should summarize the candidate's education, teaching, and professional employment; specific courses taught at Towson; honors and grants; scholarly publications; professional presentations, associations, and activities; and record of service to the university, the profession, and the community.
   c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review.
   d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
      (i) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
      (ii) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect.
      (iii) documentation of advising including but not limited to an advising log.
iv) Teaching narratives should be concise, should highlight new procedures and courses, and should address peer and student evaluations.
e. documentation of scholarship and service. This documentation should include a copy of any publication, review, presentation, grant application, or other item identified by the faculty member as part of the faculty member's scholarly activity.

2. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review and reappointment of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:
a. all of the above items listed in D.1.
b. peer and/or chairperson’s evaluations of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

3. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
a. all materials listed above in D.1. and D.2. from the faculty member’s date of hire or last promotion.
b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

4. The contents of Third Year Review and Five Year Comprehensive Reviews folders are detailed in the ART.

5. If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled —Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30.

6. If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, other than his/her evaluation, that specific information shall be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Record of the faculty member’s notification shall be tracked via the PTRM Document Review Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

7. A faculty member does not need to submit an AR binder in the year of a five-year review or when pursuing a promotion.
E. In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion or tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost that shall accompany the full evaluation portfolio from the beginning of the process. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:

Section I
- *Curriculum 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 university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. The History Department may vote to develop a supplemental student evaluation system. Results from that system would also be included in this section. Any departmental forms will compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Peer teaching evaluations.

Section IV
- Supporting Statement: 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 at the appropriate stage).
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the departmental Summary Recommendation form.
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson.
- Additional recommendations to be added by the college P&T committee and the academic dean.

Section VI
- Information added (if needed), as specified in IV, D, 5 above.
F. Student evaluation forms used in the College of Liberal Arts shall ordinarily be the University evaluation forms tabulated by the Office of Assessment. The History Department as a whole may wish to use another form for student evaluation, whether as an entire department or in selected courses not effectively evaluated by the university form. In that case, the alternate form will be included in the History PTRM policies and procedures document along with a rationale for its use and the process to be used for its administration. The form will be subject to review and approval by the CLA PTRM Committee and the UPTRM Committee. Any such student evaluation form may not be changed without formal review and approval through the process provided for the History PTRM document as a whole.

G. Peer evaluations of teaching are a required part of the review process. Further information on the evaluation of teaching is contained in section V below.

H. Lecturers and visiting assistant professors who will teach in the History Department for more than one year will be required to compile a folder following the schedule of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion folders that are prepared by other faculty. These lecturers and visiting assistant professors are responsible for preparing their folder, which should include all syllabi from the previous academic year, all student teaching evaluations from the previous year, and all peer teaching evaluations. The lecturer or visiting assistant professor will also provide a brief narrative statement detailing his or her contributions to teaching at Towson University.

I. All material placed in a file, including challenge material, becomes part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio. No materials shall be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material was included following the rules regarding the notification of the faculty member and the timeline of the review process. Documents or statements prepared by a faculty member or evaluation committee and included in the file should remain in the file in their original form, with any changes handled through the processes provided in the ART policy, Appendix 3.

J. All first year faculty shall complete the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF). In order to ensure that the History PTRM Committee fairly evaluates tenure-track faculty for reappointment, third-year review, merit, tenure, and promotion, the Committee should receive a copy of the SENTF agreement for each faculty member. Discussions of teaching and other activities should take place in the context of the expectations and agreements made when the tenure-track faculty member came to Towson.

K. All chairs and program directors (with faculty) shall complete the Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR, see Section VII) and Workload Agreement and include these in their evaluation portfolios.
V. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

A. The History PTRM document conforms with section II of Appendix 3 of the University ART policy and the CLA PTRM document in its evaluation processes associated with annual reviews, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review. In conducting these reviews, departments should provide for an assessment of faculty performance that calibrates expectations and judgments to the proportion of time allocated for each area of responsibility in the faculty member's workload. A faculty member who regularly allocates 25 percent of time to scholarship, for example, should meet significantly higher expectations for scholarly outcomes than a faculty member with 15 percent of time allocated to scholarship, and a faculty member allocating 15 percent of time to service should be providing notably more extensive service than would be expected of a faculty member allocating 5 percent to this sphere.

B. All faculty members are responsible for meeting University standards and expectations, including but not limited to those listed in this section. Meeting the general expectations specified below is essential for a faculty member's performance to be judged satisfactory in an annual review or, cumulatively, across a longer period of evaluation.

1. A faculty member shall fulfill his/her workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service; shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours; and shall meet all classes as scheduled.

2. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.

3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as examples of such wider processes).
4. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRM calendar.

C. The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, and supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation. It includes as well service as an assigned academic advisor, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context. Teaching will also be evaluated in the context of the instructor’s contributions to and support of the History Department’s curriculum, interdisciplinary programs, and assessment efforts. The intellectual rigor and workload of each class is also a factor that shapes the overall evaluation of each instructor.

D. The evaluation of teaching shall be based on materials provided in the evaluation portfolio. The assessment of teaching effectiveness will give close attention to (1) the faculty member's self-evaluation in the reflective statements included in the portfolio, (2) syllabi and other teaching materials presented by the faculty member, (3) student evaluations, (4) peer evaluations, and (5) the evaluation of student learning outcomes for the faculty member's courses where possible.

1. Self-evaluation and course materials

a. The faculty member's evaluation of his/her own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to which the faculty member wishes to call attention and should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair evaluations as appropriate.

b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and
should contain those elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.

c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.

d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall be made available to faculty members for review and shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental and college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course syllabi, the difficulty of the material taught, the course workload, and the evaluations of students and peers.

2. Evaluation of teaching by students

a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.

b. Unless the History Department as a whole votes to develop its own form, the PTRM process will use the university-wide system. The History Department may opt to recommend the cumulative use of two evaluation forms.

c. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, hybrid, and study abroad courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.

3. Evaluation of teaching by tenured peers

a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the person is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the comprehensive five-year review and for merit evaluations. The teaching evaluation letters should be addressed to the History PTRM Chair, and include the signature of the evaluator and the faculty member evaluated. The PTRM Chair, the History Chair, and the faculty member evaluated may wish to meet to discuss the evaluation.

b. In completing written peer teaching evaluations, reviewers will adhere to the Peer Evaluation Form in Appendix B.
At a minimum, peer evaluations will be performed by History PTRM Committee members once every semester for tenure-track faculty during their first six (6) semesters (through the 3rd year review year) and then once a year until they receive tenure. Tenured Associate Professors should be evaluated once a year. Tenured Full Professors should be evaluated every other year with at least two evaluations completed for each five-year review. Full time lecturers and visiting assistant professors who will be at Towson more than one academic year will be evaluated every other semester (once each academic year). These guidelines do not include summer or minimester teaching.

At the start of each academic year, the History PTRM Committee Chair will select a three-person subcommittee, based on a rotating list (including at least one junior faculty member, if one is available) to develop a list of evaluators and courses to evaluate in consultation with faculty. Membership of this subcommittee will be on a rotating basis. The Subcommittee members will select a Chair. A preliminary list of peer evaluators (who must be tenured faculty) and classes to evaluate will be completed in the first three weeks of each semester. The History Department as a whole may vote to require a template form or letter format for all peer teaching evaluations.

d. In every case the evaluator shall strive to choose a class meeting most amenable to the individual under evaluation. The faculty member being evaluated will have at least two weeks notice of any peer review. The evaluation shall not be performed in the final two weeks of the semester unless requested by the faculty member being evaluated. Evaluations must be completed, reviewed, signed, and filed with the History Department by the end of the semester in which they were performed. It is the Responsibility of the PTRM Chair to ensure these are completed.

4. Evaluation of advising

a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.

b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class-teaching responsibilities, advising
groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research committee, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.

c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio. These may include but are not limited to the evidence of regular and reliable records of the advice given, discussion of advising by the faculty member in Annual Review reports, logs of advising appointments, optional peer or chair review of advising, notable instances of positive advising contributions or of advising errors, letters of recommendation written on behalf of students, research mentoring beyond the expectations of course supervision, definable contributions through organizational or group advising, evidence of significant contributions to career advising, or other advising contributions for the benefit of students as the department may determine.

E. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's tangible contributions to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly, peer-reviewed, materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:
   a. **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university.
   b. **Scholarship of Discovery** – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake.
   c. **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
   d. **Scholarship of Teaching** – exploring experience of effective teaching and student learning through peer-reviewed publications.

2. In presenting their scholarship for review or in evaluating the work of others, faculty shall be guided by the definitions of scholarship noted above. The forms of scholarly publication faculty members produce differ among fields; it is therefore the responsibility of faculty members to explain how their scholarship fits the norms of their field and contributes
to their scholarly growth. These forms of scholarship may, but not exclusively, consist of

a. Scholarly monographs based on original research, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community by a university press (or its equivalent).

b. Scholarly journal articles (published in print/ and or digitally) or book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally) based on original research, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.

c. Scholarly edited article or essay collections (published in print/ and or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.

d. Scholarly historiographic journal articles (published in print/ and or digitally) or book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.

e. Translations and/or document collections (published in print/ and or digitally) that contain scholarly notes and discussions, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.

f. Museum or public history exhibitions (whether physical or digital) based on scholarly research, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community when the faculty member acts as curator.

g. Bibliographies, resource guides, and research aides (published in print/ and or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.

h. Public history or other research and public dissemination of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure to make clear how these efforts illustrate intellectual rigor and make a contribution to his or her field.

I. Co-authored, co-edited, and collaborative examples of any of the above forms of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the individual to make clear their contributions to the work.

3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed
work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the
work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly
or public community will have ready access and that the work has been
reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly
materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review
process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the
means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues.

4. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the
University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or
international, similar presentations involving review or recognition by
scholarly peers, and book reviews may all provide evidence of scholarly
engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress
toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may
not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in sections 3 and
4 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.

Reprints of previously published materials show scholarly engagement
and support the growing reputation of faculty members, but do not count
as part of the scholarship necessary for promotion or tenure unless they
have been significantly revised from their original version. It is the duty
of the faculty member to show how the reprinted or republished work
makes a new contribution to the field.

5. Faculty reviews of all types, including annual reviews, merit reviews,
third-year reviews, and comprehensive reviews, should give due attention
to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an
interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's
continuing professional development. Although some faculty may
emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload
assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop
disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of
professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios. Reports
on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, papers presented to
colleagues, systematic preparation for teaching topics new to the faculty
member, collection and analysis of data or information for a community
purpose, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the
department, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or
professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for
the evidence required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or
promotion.

F. To the extent possible, evaluation of service should consider the extent and
quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position
held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of
service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment
of its relation to the mission of the university or the faculty member’s field.

1. University service involves substantive participation in the shared
governance activities of the department, college and university. This
includes contributions and leadership of interdisciplinary or graduate
programs outside of the History Department.

2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local,
regional, national or global).

3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or
participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional,
national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance
the university's mission.

G. Chairs, who are responsible for supervising faculty, shall be evaluated in the
additional category of leadership. Chair activities are reported as part of their
annual review on the CAR form and constitute a minimum of fifty percent of the
chair's workload by university policy. Departments shall recognize in their
evaluation of chairs a distribution of responsibilities and expectations consistent
with the chair's workload agreements. Evaluators will recognize that chair
responsibilities may involve personnel matters or dealings with students governed
by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such
matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless
make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair
has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university
policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Program directors who
supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be
evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to
such work under their workload agreements. The History PTRM Chair will lead a
discussion of the Chair’s performance each year prior to the History PTRM
meeting devoted to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This discussion should
occur either during a regular faculty meeting or the PTRM Chair shall invite
junior faculty to participate in part of a PTRM meeting, though they cannot vote
on reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In consultation with other faculty, the
History PTRM Chair will draft a letter for the CLA Dean. A copy of this letter
will be forwarded to the History Chair.

H. The expectations for reappointment depend upon whether the faculty member is
tenure track, a lecturer, or a visiting assistant professor.

Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated based on their success at meeting the
requirements of the SENTF, and their gradual progress toward meeting the
university, CLA, and History Department standards for promotion and tenure as
detailed below. A steadily expanding rotation of courses taught, strong teaching
Lecturers and visiting assistant professors serving more than one academic year will be evaluated based on their commitment to excellent and innovative teaching through student evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, and the lecturer/VAP folder.

I. The expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the College of Liberal Arts and tenure shall include the following. There may be unusual circumstances when the History PTRM Committee choose to grant tenure but not support immediate promotion.

1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission.

2. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college, and as defined by section V above.

3. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards of dissemination and validation. At a minimum faculty are expected to publish three (3) peer-reviewed articles/book chapters or one (1) monograph as defined by section V above. The History PTRM Committee would expect a larger output—four or five items—of the other items detailed in the scholarship section above. While it is understood that faculty's academic interests will evolve, it is expected that their scholarship remain consistent with historical study and related fields.

In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure, the History PTRM Committee will consider anything published after the faculty member began his or her tenure track position at Towson and anything under contract prior to completing the promotion and tenure folder for consideration by the Committee. If a work is under contract the faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent of progress.

4. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, as defined in Section V. Standards and Criteria of this document.
J.  The expectations for the Third Year Review are based on progress toward promotion and tenure as detailed above. The three levels of progress are as follows:

- **Superior.** Requirements include excellence in teaching (in all its components including advising), excellence in scholarship and meeting department standards in service.

- **Satisfactory.** Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This essentially means that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.

- **Unsatisfactory.** This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

K.  The faculty member recommended for promotion to Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of accomplishment in teaching, service, and scholarship since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

1.  The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio and as defined in section V above.

2.  The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor. At a minimum faculty are expected to publish three (3) peer-reviewed articles/ book chapters or one (1) monograph as defined by section V above. The History PTRM Committee would expect a larger output—four or five items--of the other items detailed in the scholarship section above. While it is understood that faculty’s academic interests will evolve, it is expected that their scholarship remain consistent with historical study and related fields. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent with establishing a national or international scholarly reputation.

In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure, the History PTRM Committee will consider anything published while the faculty member served as an associate professor. If a work is under contract the faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent of progress. However, if the item was under contract prior to promotion and tenure, and the faculty member used the contract to advance his or her tenure and promotion case, it may not be used for the
promotion to full professor. In short, any scholarship, whether under contract or in the final published version, may only be counted once. Anything under contract prior to completing the promotion to full professor folder may be considered. Finally, anything published after the file for promotion to associate professor and tenure was completed may be used for the promotion to full professor.

3. The faculty member shall have presented evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession in the period after promotion to Associate Professor, as defined in section V above. Faculty members are expected to show leadership in university, CLA, and History Department initiatives, as well as effective mentorship of other faculty.

L. The expectations for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are based on the continuation of the performance and accomplishments required for promotion and tenure above. The two levels of evaluation for the Review are as follows:

1. Positive. Requirements include maintaining excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department.

2. Negative. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions: teaching, service, or scholarship. This essentially marks a clear decline from the accomplishments that justified promotion to full professor or the satisfactory record of a previous Five Year Comprehensive Review.

M. Any exceptions to the standards outlined above shall be consistent with the provisions of the Towson University ART policy, and the specific rationale for any recommendation involving an exception shall be spelled out in the appropriate letter of recommendation in the faculty member's evaluation file.

N. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. The timing of merit evaluations and recommendations will follow the ART and the CLA PTRM documents as shown in Appendix A. There are three categories of merit:

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

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

3. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.
A rating of satisfactory shall mean at minimum that (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in section V of this document; (b) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as evidenced in the sources of evidence appropriate to annual review as described above; (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly work through the annual report, whether that work has been completed or is in progress; (d) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service as defined in section V above.

A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of section V of this document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. Evaluation of accomplishment meriting a rating of excellent shall be made in accordance with the proportion of a faculty member's time allocated to each area of responsibility in the annual workload assignment.

In order to clarify which publications count toward merit decisions, the History Merit Subcommittee will consider publications in their merit decisions once that material has been published.

VI. CALENDAR

CLA and the History Department follow the Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar as published in Appendix 3 of the ART policy (Appendix A below). If the published university calendar changes, the CLA calendar may change without formal amendment of the History PTRM document.
Appendix A

College of Liberal Arts Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar

The first Friday in May
Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

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

August 1 (USM mandated)
Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member’s appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

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

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

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

The Fourth Friday in September
Department chairperson notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member’s intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
The Second Friday in October
A. Department PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

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

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

November 30th
A. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
B. The dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s home.

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

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

December 15th (USM mandated date)
Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

The First Friday in January
A. The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
B. The college PTRM committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

The Third Friday in January
A. The dean’s written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.
The college PTRM committee’s report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean’s recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

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

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

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

The First Friday in February

A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee’s and the dean’s recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

B. The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

A. The dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM committee.

C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

March 1

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

First Friday in March

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

Third Friday in March

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


**Department of History**

**Peer Evaluation Observation Form**

---

**Instructor's Name:**

**Observer's Name:**

**Number and Course Title:**

**Date of Classroom Observation:**

**Number of students in attendance:**

---

### Class activities (check all that apply):

- [ ] Class Discussion
- [ ] Student Presentations
- [ ] Group work
- [ ] Lecture
- [ ] Writing Workshops
- [ ] Other (please describe below)

---

### Pedagogy

1. **Organization of the class:** Identifying a central purpose, holding to it, integrating questions and answers into it, clarifying major points in it, managing time, etc.

   **Comments:**

2. **Teaching strategy:** E.g., classroom manner, classroom presence, innovation, ability to guide a discussion or workshop, responsiveness to student input, clarity, etc.

   **Comments:**

---
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3. Academic Rigor: To what degree did the classroom activities and reading and writing assignments meet the intellectual expectations of a course at this level? To what degree did the faculty member encourage critical thinking and careful reasoning?

Comments:

4. Student Engagement: To what degree did the faculty member encourage student engagement and enthusiasm (through dialogue, energy level, eye contact, calling upon students by name, etc.)?

Comments:

5. Environmental Conditions: Please comment here on environmental conditions that affected the session (e.g. too hot or cold, technology not working, construction sounds intruded, etc.).

Comments:

### Syllabus-Required Information

According to the Faculty Handbook, the following information is required on all syllabi. Check all that apply.

- [ ] Course name and number
- [ ] Catalogue Description
- [ ] Instructor information (name, email address, telephone and office numbers)
- [ ] Text[s] required including bibliographic information
- [ ] Brief description of course content
- [ ] Learning Outcomes Statement (including Core Outcomes where appropriate)
- [ ] Assignments and requirements
- [ ] Grading procedures
- [ ] Attendance Policy
- [ ] Academic Integrity Policy
- [ ] Students with Disabilities Policy
- [ ] Course Repeat Policy
- [ ] A week-by-week or session-by-session calendar

### Syllabus-Supplemental Information
Other information (Check all that apply):

- Test and/or Assignment make-up policy
- Other—Include and/or comment on any information that you found particularly effective in communicating expectations and requirements.
Pre- and Post- Conference with Instructor

The observation process and form are meant to serve both an evaluative and a mentoring purpose. The Pre and post-observation conferences should be a dialogue between observer and the observed faculty member.

Date of Pre-Meeting:
Date of Post-Meeting:
Optional Comments:

According to Towson University’s ART policy, page 3-16

3. For every type of evaluation, including annual review, 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.

Observer’s Signature ______________________________

Instructor’s Signature ______________________________

Date Completed and Submitted to the Department ________