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DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT AND MERIT

Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) of Towson University and its appendices (in particular, Appendix 3, “Tenured and Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty Evaluations: Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review”), as well as the PTRM Policies and Procedures document of the College of Liberal Arts (CLA).

I. PRESUMPTIONS GOVERNING DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT DECISIONS

A. The promotion and tenure policies and procedures of the Department of Family Studies and Community Development follow those established in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) of Faculty (02-01.00) and are in accordance with the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit (PTRM) Committee (11-11-10).

B. All faculty members are entitled to fairness and due process in promotion, reappointment, tenure, and merit deliberations.

C. The Department encourages diversity in pedagogy, scholarly practices, and interdisciplinary interests.

D. The Department encourages shared responsibility and collaborative decision-making.

E. The Department considers teaching effectiveness to have primary importance in each faculty member’s professional priorities, followed closely by scholarship and service.
F. Promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit decisions are made on an individual basis and on their own merits, according to each faculty member’s Annual Report and Agreement on Annual Workload.

G. Each faculty member is responsible for providing the departmental Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committees with any and all required forms and other materials in support of his/her candidacy for promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit in a timely and professional manner. Failure to do so is sufficient cause for the Committee to deny promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit. Since a faculty member is in the best position to understand and present her/his own accomplishments, s/he should frame reasons for promotion and/or tenure and/or a successful First-Year, Third-Year, and Comprehensive (Post-Tenure) Review in a letter addressed to the Committee. Committee evaluation for reappointment and/or merit can be made on the basis of the faculty member’s Annual Report(s) and Agreement(s) on Annual Workload only, but the faculty member is entitled to address a letter to the Committee should he or she so choose.

H. Faculty members of the Department of Family Studies and Community Development are defined as those holding full-time tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer appointments in the Department.

II. MEMBERSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT, AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE CHAIR

A. The FMST Department has two committees managing the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Annual Review and Merit process. These are the (a) Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee (PTR) and the (b) Merit Committee. Changes to this document will be initiated in the PTR Committee but will be the responsibility of both Department Committees. All faculty members of the Department, regardless of rank, vote on the adoption of any changes to the document and policies contained therein. Document changes shall be approved by a majority vote and forwarded to the
College of Liberal Arts Promotion and Tenure Committee by the first Friday in December.

B. Faculty members who are otherwise eligible to vote but are on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence may participate in Promotion, Tenure and Merit decisions and vote on these matters provided that they fully participate in all deliberative activities regarding the candidates in question.

The composition of the PTRM Committee will be modified through revisions to this document in the academic year when permanent members of the Department’s faculty include a minimum of three tenured faculty members excluding the Chairperson of the Department. Composition of the PTR Committee as outlined in Section II3Bi follows a structure that modifies the TU Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty (02-01.00.) The composition of the PTR Committee outlined below was subject to approval by the provost and legal counsel of the university on April 4, 2011.

C. Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee (PTR)

1. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee Chair: The Chair will be elected for a 3-year term from the ranks of the PTR committee. Eligible members include tenured faculty members and faculty members approved for tenure in their final probationary year. Individuals cannot serve more than two consecutive 3-year terms as Committee Chair. When needed, elections will take place in April. Elections will be held by written confidential ballot. The Chair assumes office in June of that year.

The Chair is responsible for:

a. Guiding the reappointment, third year review, promotion and tenure processes and insuring that the policies outlined in this document are followed.

b. Organizing and chairing all relevant committee meetings.
c. Facilitating the naming of possible external members for the Committee as needed.

d. Providing reasonable counsel to faculty members in gathering materials, preparing forms, and assembling dossiers for use in promotion, tenure, merit, and review deliberations.

e. Ensuring the completion of documentation and securing necessary signatures.

f. Recording the vote count for all deliberations.

g. Giving formal written notice of reappointment and tenure decisions to the Department Chairperson to be passed on to the individual concerned and to the proper College and University authorities and committees.

h. Participating with the Department Chair in the presentation of the written recommendations deriving from Third-Year and Comprehensive Reviews.

i. Participating with the Department Chair in the presentation of written reasons in cases of non-renewal or non-recommendation for tenure.

j. Working with the Merit Committee Chair in the development and distribution of the faculty peer evaluation schedule and tracking the completion of peer evaluations.

k. Working with the Merit Committee Chair in the review and revision of the Department P&T document and submitting possible changes to the department chairperson.

l. Working with the Merit Committee Chair conducting a P,T&M refresher seminar to all faculty in the spring semester as part of a faculty meeting in May.

m. Designating a member of the committee to take minutes and record attendance at PTR Committee meetings, and disseminate these minutes to committee members and the Department Chairperson.

2. The Chair of the subcommittee shall excuse her/himself from deliberations concerning her/his own dossier. Whenever the Chair excuses him/herself from
deliberations on his/her own materials, the senior member of the remaining committee shall serve as Chair pro tempore.

3. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR) Committee Composition
   a. The PTR Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members in the department. Faculty members must attend all deliberations to vote.
   b. In the case where there are fewer than 3 tenured faculty members, the Department will supplement the Committee with tenured faculty members from other departments for the minimum requirement of 3 faculty members on the committee (excluding the Department Chair).
      i. If committee members external to the department are needed, the additional faculty members will be identified from a potential list of committee members. Individuals expecting to come up for tenure, promotion or reappointment during the subsequent two years will together identify possible committee members from tenured faculty in other departments. At least three faculty members must be named if one additional member is needed for the committee; at least five if two additional members are needed.

   The identification of additional members will be facilitated by the PTR Chairperson the first week in May so that the list is ready to be submitted to the Department Chairperson by the second Friday in May. The Department Chair and Dean will review the list and make recommendations to the college PTRM committee on or before June 1st. The Dean will determine if potential committee members are willing to serve on the FMST PTR committee prior to making a recommendation to the college PTRM Committee. The
college PTRM committee will select members to serve a two year term by the third Friday in June.

c. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will review clinical faculty. This committee will be the same as the PTR Committee with the addition of a clinical faculty member who has been in the role of clinical faculty for more than three years. (02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit V.D.5.b.)

4. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee Responsibilities

a. Review the portfolios submitted by faculty members and compare them to annual reports, workload agreements, and Curriculum Vitae.

b. Compare planned workload agreements to accomplishments over the period of review.

c. Attend all meetings of the Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee.

d. Make promotion, tenure, third year review, and reappointment recommendations based on the guidelines outlined in this document.

e. Complete comprehensive 5-year reviews based on the guidelines in this document and prepare a report based on the review.

f. Prepare a report for each tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty member outlining the reappointment decision and/or advancement towards promotion and/or tenure. All committee members must sign the report. The faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read, but not necessarily agreed with, the evaluation.

g. Complete the Department Summary Recommendation Form.

h. All committee members must vote. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes the abstention. When faculty has a professional or
familial conflict of interest, they must disclose the conflict and seek authorization for the abstention.

i. Participate in any revisions to the PTRM document under the guidance of the PTR Committee Chairperson and the Merit Committee Chairperson.

D. Merit Committee

1. Merit Committee Chair: The Merit Chair will be elected for a 3-year term by the newly formed Merit committee. To fill any vacant seats to begin the following academic year, elections will take place in April or as soon as a vacancy occurs at a department meeting. Elections will be held by written confidential ballot. The Chair assumes office in June of that year.

The Chair is responsible for:

a. Guiding the merit process and ensuring that the policies outlined in this document are followed.

b. Organizing and chairing all relevant committee meetings.

c. Providing reasonable counsel to faculty members in gathering materials, preparing forms, and assembling dossiers for use in promotion, tenure, merit, and review deliberations.

d. Ensuring the completion of documentation and securing necessary signatures.

e. Recording the vote count for all deliberations.

f. Working with the PTR Committee Chair in the development and distribution of the faculty peer evaluation schedule and tracking the completion of peer evaluations.

g. Working with the PTR Committee Chair in the review of the Department PTRM documents and submitting possible changes to the Department Chairperson.

h. Working with the PTR Committee Chair conducting a P, T&M refresher seminar to all faculty in the spring semester as part of a faculty meeting in May.
i. Designating a member of the committee to take minutes and attendance at Merit committee meetings, and disseminate these minutes to committee members and the Department Chairperson.

2. The Chair of the subcommittee shall excuse her/himself from deliberations concerning her/his own dossier. Whenever the Chair excuses him/herself from deliberations on his/her own materials, the senior member of the remaining committee shall serve as Chair pro tempore.

3. Merit Committee Composition
   a. The FMST Department Merit Committee is a four person committee, including the committee chair each of whom attends all committee meetings. During the Spring semester, the Departmental Chair shall solicit self-nominations from tenured, tenure track and clinical faculty for election to the Merit Committee for the following academic year, and shall ensure that the self-nominations include a minimum of three tenured and/or tenure track, and one clinical faculty members. By the first Friday in April, all tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty will vote according to confidential ballots. When needed, elections will take place in April or as soon as a vacancy occurs at a department meeting.

   b. The department chair serves as a member in an ex officio capacity and does not vote. Committee members are to serve three-year terms and can serve no more than two consecutive terms. Committee chairs are to serve three-year terms and can serve no more than two consecutive terms.

4. Merit Committee Responsibilities
   a. Review the portfolios submitted by faculty members and compare them to the Annual Report Part I, Annual Review Part II Workload Agreement, and Curriculum Vitae.
b. Make recommendations regarding merit for all faculty based on the faculty members’ approved workload agreements for the previous year, and the guidelines outlined in this document.

c. Attend all meetings of the Merit Committee.

d. As a group, prepare a report for each faculty member outlining merit recommendations and the reasons behind them. All committee members must sign the report.

e. Prepare the Department Summary Recommendation form for each faculty member reviewed. Individual committee members shall excuse her/himself from deliberations concerning her/his own dossier.

f. All committee members must vote. No committee member shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes the abstention. When faculty has a professional or familial conflict of interest, they must disclose the conflict and seek authorization for the abstention.

E. Role of Department Chairperson

1. The Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the PTR Committee and the Merit Committee. S/he shall participate in all deliberations regardless of her/his academic rank, except for deliberations on her/his own dossier.

2. The Department Chair shall attend PTR committee meetings and participate in discussions but will not serve as a voting member of the committee.

3. The Department Chair will compose a separate evaluation report for each faculty member under review for tenure and promotion following the guidelines outlined in the Towson University ART Appendix 3.
4. The Department Chair shall attend Merit committee meetings and participate in presentation of portfolios and merit discussions but will not serve as a voting member of the committee.

5. The Department Chair may prepare an independent merit recommendation report.

6. The Department Chair along with the PTR Committee Chair will meet with faculty members undergoing third year review. The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss PRM Committee’s recommendations and progress to tenure.

7. The Department Chair may prepare a separate report for reappointment of clinical faculty.

8. The Department Chair will prepare a separate report for all clinical faculty considered for promotion.

9. The Department Chair will meet with all faculty members to discuss their annual reports, student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the Department’s PTRM Committees recommendations, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

III. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

A. Standards and Expectations

The Family Studies and Community Development Department PTRM Committees evaluate candidate files in relation to the standards and expectations established by the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts, and the criteria of the Family Studies and Community Development Department.

B. Quorum
A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members. Faculty members who are otherwise eligible to vote but are on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence may participate in Promotion, Tenure and Merit decisions and vote on these matters provided that they fully participate in all deliberative activities regarding the candidates in question.

C. Voting Procedures

All voting shall be by confidential ballot (Appendix D Form 1) cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate, signed with a Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes shall be tallied and compiled by the Committee Chair using Appendix D Form 2. (The completion of Form D2 is not contingent on any restrictions regarding recommendations for Base Plus Merit). The Committee Chair will forward to the Chair of the Department a signed by all committee members, dated report of the vote using Appendix D, Form 3, the confidential ballots and the committee’s recommendation. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded by the Chair of the Department under separate cover to the Provost.

A majority of those voting must support the granting of tenure, promotion, reappointment, or merit for the various PTRM committees to reach a favorable decision. 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 member of any PTRM Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

D. Confidentiality

Members of the 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 Chair or the Dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
E. Appeal Procedures

The Family Studies and Community Development Department follows the appeals procedures laid out in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, V, B, 1-3. Faculty members may appeal to the College PTRM Committee negative judgments made at the department level on questions of tenure, promotion, comprehensive review, reappointment, and merit, if the appeal is on substantive grounds. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by the Department Committee or Chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The faculty member shall have 21 calendar days from the date that a negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of a certified letter to file an appeal. The appeal must clearly state in writing the grounds for the appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under consideration with any statement, evidence, or other documents believed to present a more valid perspective on performance. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chair and the Chair of the PTRM Committee.

Faculty members may also submit procedural appeals to the University PTRM Committee, or appeals alleging unlawful discrimination, as provided for in the University ART policy, Appendix 3, and Towson University policy 06-01.00.

F. Document Changes

Every three years after the first approval of the PTRM policies and procedures document, the FMST PTR and Merit Committees will review and vote to either approve the existing document or begin the process to change the document.

G. Evaluation Procedures

1. General Policies and Procedures
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. The full evaluation portfolio shall be assembled by the individual being considered for annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review according to the guidelines described in the “Documentation & Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of the Towson University ART policy and Section IV pg. 14 of this document.

c. 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.

d. All clinical, tenured and tenure-track, and lecturer faculty shall be evaluated by students using instruments and procedures which assure confidentiality for the student. Faculty shall be evaluated for every course taught, including on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses, taught during the academic year, mini-mester, and summer terms.

e. All clinical, tenured and tenure-track, and lecturer faculty shall undergo peer evaluation through classroom observation by colleagues in the department. (APPENDIX B pg. 42 this document)

   i. Such observations will be scheduled at least one week in advance with the consent of the faculty member to be observed.

   ii. The faculty member may express a preference as to which class(es) will be observed.

   iii. Faculty are encouraged to undergo peer evaluation for a mix of classes – lower level, upper level and seminars as appropriate.

   iv. Tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer faculty shall undergo classroom observation and peer evaluation at least once per academic year.

   v. Tenured faculty shall undergo classroom observation and peer evaluation at least twice during the period of their comprehensive review or application for promotion.
2. Annual Review for Merit

a. The Merit Committee shall annually review clinical, tenured and tenure-track, and lecturer faculty for merit.

b. The Department Chair shall be responsible for presenting to the Merit Committee all the evaluation portfolios for all eligible faculty members in the Department.

c. The Merit Committee shall evaluate the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each candidate. The report shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The report shall be submitted to the Department Chair no later than the second Friday of October.

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

e. The merit recommendation and statement shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of the Department-Chairperson’s statement, record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday of October. A vote of no merit shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

f. The Chair of the Merit Committee shall forward the evaluation portfolios, Chair recommendation if included, and the Department vote count record to the Dean’s office by the second Friday in November.

3. Reappointment: First-Year Faculty and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

a. The PTR Committee shall evaluate each new faculty member’s first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will evaluate the reappointment of Clinical Faculty during the first year.

b. This evaluation shall be conducted and completed by the third Friday in January.
c. Each faculty member shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during his/her first semester. The evaluation portfolio must be finalized with the Department Chairperson by the third Friday in September. The evaluation portfolio must include peer evaluations of teaching, documentation of scholarship and service activities, syllabi of current courses, and a reflective summary of teaching, scholarship, and service. For all new tenure track faculty, the evaluation folder must also include the Standards and Expectations of New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form.

d. The faculty member shall submit the evaluation portfolio to the Department Chair no later than the second Friday of December.

e. The PTR Committee shall review the evaluation portfolio and shall prepare a written report, with vote count. The recommendation for reappointment shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation shall be submitted to the Department Chair by the first Friday in January.

f. The Department Chair may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the third Friday in January.

g. The recommendation shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member and the Dean, inclusive of the Department Chairperson’s recommendation and a record of the vote count, no later than the third Friday in January. A negative recommendation shall be delivered in person by the Department Chair or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

h. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 2, g-j.

4. Reappointment: Second-Year Faculty and Annual Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

a. The Family Studies and Community Development Department follows the procedures for the reappointment of second-year faculty laid out in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, III, D, 3, a-g.
b. Evaluation procedures for annual reappointment for Clinical Faculty after their first-year of appointment shall be the same as the evaluation procedures for reappointment of second-year faculty set forth in section III.D.3.a-e of Appendix 3, except that the Clinical Evaluation Committee shall be substituted for the department PTRM committee. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will follow 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit V.C. & D.

5. Reappointment: Third- through Fifth-Year Faculty

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

6. Third-Year Review

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

b. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the PTR Committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy and Section IV pg. 21 of this document.

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

i. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading to a positive promotion and tenure decision, and

ii. must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

d. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

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

ii. Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the Department. This ranking indicates that the Department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are needed.

iii. Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

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

f. Feedback shall be in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the chair of the PTR Committee no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the Dean.

7. Tenure and/or Promotion

a. The PTR Committee shall review evaluation portfolios for tenure and/or promotion and Associate Professor and shall prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and
university/civic/professional service. Recommendations should be submitted to the Department Chair by the second Friday in October.

b. Clinical Faculty. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will review portfolios for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor. The Committee shall prepare a written report with recommendations and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching, advising, scholarship, administrative accomplishment and service. (Recommendations should be submitted to the Department Chair by the second Friday in October.

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

d. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chair’s statement and a record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

e. The faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Department Committee, the written evaluation of the Department Chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the chair of the PTR Committee to the Dean’s office by the second Friday in November.

8. Three Year Appointment for Clinical Faculty

a. Upon request by the Clinical Faculty member, Clinical Faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and higher may be considered for a three-year contract. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will follow procedures set forth in the 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Section: V.D. 12.

9. Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

a. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.

b. The PTR Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios of faculty members standing for their Comprehensive Five-Year Review and prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count. Recommendations shall contain...
reference to each category evaluated including teaching/ advising, scholarship
and university /civic/ professional service, and should be submitted to the
Department Chairperson by the second Friday in October.
c. The Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of the college
shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the
Department. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement
during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an
intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the
comprehensive review process at the discretion of the Dean of the college.
d. The Department Chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each
faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member’s
evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
e. The faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written
recommendation of the Department Committee, the written evaluation of the
Department Chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the chair of the
PTR Committee to the Dean’s office by the second Friday in November.
f. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a
written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member’s
failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review.
This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by
the Chair and the Dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in
which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty
member, Chair and Dean.

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. Request for consideration for promotion and/or tenure must be submitted in writing to the
Department Chairperson by the third Friday in September the year prior to the review.
C. Guided by the Department Chairperson, Chairperson of PTR and Merit Committees and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

D. 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.

E. 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. 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.

e. Documentation of scholarship (Clinical Faculty: scholarship/administrative ability –Appendix C) 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.
   i. 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.
   ii. 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.

2. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer faculty must include the following documents:
   a. all of the above items listed in E.1
b. peer and/or Chairperson’s evaluation(s) 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 E.1. and E.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. If confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college
   promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made
   available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty
   evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent
   level of review.

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

6. If the Chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the
   faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, other than his/her evaluation, that specific
   information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing
   evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Solicited
   external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but will be forwarded
   under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member’s
   notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit
   (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within
five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

F. 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. Those using departmental forms should 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. The statement must include a discussion of
advising responsibilities that reflect records from advising sessions.

Section V

- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party at the appropriate stage).
- Written recommendation of the Department Rank Committee and/or
  Reappointment and 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, E. 5 above.

G. Student evaluation forms used in the College of Liberal Arts shall ordinarily be the
   University evaluation forms tabulated by the Office of Assessment.

H. Peer evaluations are a required part of the review process. Procedures are included as
   APPENDIX B, pg. 42 of this document. Peer evaluations should use the peer observation
   form, as appropriate to the situation.

I. Upon request of the faculty member, external evaluations may be conducted as part of a
   FMST faculty member's tenure or promotion evaluation. The evaluation must comply
   with University policy on external evaluations. Faculty must submit such requests in
   writing to both the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Department of Family
   Studies and Community Development PTR Committee by no later than February 1st of
   the calendar year in which the tenure and/or promotion evaluation will occur.

V. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

A. A faculty member in the Department of Family Studies and Community Development
   shall meet the standards and expectations set forth in the Towson University Policy on
Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (02-01.00) and in accordance with the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit (PTRM) Committee

B. All faculty 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 and 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 Department considers teaching effectiveness to be of primary importance, followed closely by scholarship and service. Therefore, all evaluations—merit, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and third and fifth year reviews will be premised on this consideration.

D. Areas of Evaluation
   a. TEACHING AND ADVISING— including intentional advising of students, directed readings, independent studies, honor’s theses, and graduate theses.
   b. SCHOLARSHIP – every faculty member under review must be involved in scholarly endeavors (Clinical Faculty: scholarship/demonstrated administrative ability/accomplishment – Appendix C) that reach a professional community beyond the University.
   c. SERVICE – every member of the faculty is expected to participate in departmental, college and/or university/professional service.

E. Criteria for Teaching and Advising: Criteria for evaluating teaching and advising shall be based on the following considerations:

   1. striving for excellence and competence as a teacher in courses at all levels of the curriculum, as appropriate to the faculty member’s areas of expertise and interests and the department’s curricular needs.
   2. exhibiting on-going growth as a classroom teacher at all stages of the career, developing new methods, pedagogies, and competencies and engaging in honest self-evaluation.
   3. demonstrating competency as reflected in peer and student evaluations
4. developing new courses and curricular initiatives.

5. striving for excellence in advising and mentoring students.

6. constructively addressing any areas of concern which may be expressed in student and peer evaluations, merit deliberations, etc.

7. meeting all classes as scheduled and informing the Department Chair of circumstances requiring absences.

8. preparing syllabi for each course in accordance with University and Department standards and filing a copy of each syllabus with the Department.

F. Evaluation of Teaching and Advising shall take four forms:

1. Self-evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching and advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/Chairperson evaluations.

2. Student evaluation of teaching is required and is one kind of evaluation to be considered in concert with all other measures of teaching effectiveness. Student evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner to assure confidentiality of the student. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, mini-mester, and summer terms.

3. Evaluation of teaching by peers requires peer observations be conducted per review period, as frequently as appropriate. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member. Guidelines for performing and reporting classroom observations, including online courses, can be found in Appendix B.
4. Evaluation of advising will include excerpts from student responses to department administered surveys prior to graduation and may include the inclusion of letters of recommendation written on behalf of students for graduate study or employment, discussion of advising in Annual Review, and/or significant contributions to career advising.

G. Scholarship: Evaluation of Scholarship shall be based on the following:

1. The quality and value of scholarship shall be subject to the professional judgment of the members of the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment, Merit and Clinical Evaluation Committees, who shall consider such things as the audience of journals or conferences, the rigor of the refereeing process, reviews, administrative accomplishment, or other outside evidence of the quality of the work. Examples of such work may include:
   a. the writing and dissemination of peer reviewed articles or peer reviewed books
   b. the writing and dissemination of book chapters both refereed and non-refereed
   c. presentations at international, national, regional and TU professional conferences
   d. serving as principal investigator/co-investigator on an external grant related to the faculty member’s discipline
   e. invited lectures
   f. external grant-writing (submitted)
   g. external grant writing (funded)
   h. chairing and organizing a conference panel
   i. panel participant/discussion in area of expertise at professional conferences
   j. review of scholarly manuscripts and other scholarship within the peer-reviewing process
   k. invited publications and lectures.

Published scholarship will be considered toward a rating of Excellent in the year of documentation of acceptance for publication.
2. For Clinical faculty: demonstrated administrative ability/accomplishments include areas below. A detailed document with examples of the broad areas can be found in APPENDIX C

   a. Leadership associated with all department internship, service learning and community partner activities
   b. Oversight of all sequential department developed field work courses (FMST 297 Preparing Human Service Workers: Pre-Internship, FMST 397 Internship in Family and Human Services and FMST 497 Advanced Internship in Family Studies and Community Development)
   c. Student Development including Managing Student Issues Related to Field Work and Field Work Courses
   d. Community Engagement and Collaboration
   e. Maintaining a high level of Clinical/Professional Excellence including appropriate professional licensure.

H. Service: Evaluation of service shall consider the following:

   1. service to the Department in the form of committee work and work requested by the Department.

   2. service to the College of Liberal Arts, the University or the University System of Maryland.

   3. service within the discipline

   4. professionally related service to the community

I. Annual Review for Merit includes the following three rankings:

   1. Excellent: A faculty member shows evidence of excellent achievement in at least two performance areas (teaching/advising, scholarship, and service) and at least
satisfactory achievement in the other area according to the criteria specified under Standards and Criteria B through H above.

2. Satisfactory: A faculty member shows evidence of satisfactory achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service according to the criteria under Standards and Criteria B through H above.

3. Not Meritorious: A faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory in one or more of the areas specified under Standards and Criteria B through H above.

A document with examples of excellence can be found in APPNDIX D

J. Tenure

1. The probationary faculty member must, in the judgment of the members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, have met the department’s Standards and Criteria specified in B through H above, including:
   a. teaching effectiveness consistent with the Department’s norms
   b. serving the University and the Department in a substantial and sustained manner,
   c. Sustained and substantial intellectual, professional, scholarly development resulting in dissemination which includes peer reviewed publication.
   d. Collegiality and academic citizenship

2. The decision to recommend tenure is based on the professional judgment of the members of the Tenure Committee, who may consider the candidate’s future potential as well as past performance.

K. Promotion

1. To Associate Professor
   a. The minimum years in rank as specified by the University.
b. Excellence and commitment to teaching demonstrated by teaching effectiveness consistent with Departmental norms and by continued commitment to course and department development.

c. Sustained and substantial intellectual, professional, scholarly development resulting in dissemination which includes peer reviewed publication.

d. Satisfactory performance in all other areas specified under Standards and Criteria B through H above.

e. Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

Clinical Faculty at all ranks (except Clinical Professor) are eligible for review for promotion. The minimum number of years in rank is six years full-time University teaching for Associate Clinical Professors. Review will normally occur no earlier than the sixth-year in a Clinical Faculty position. Evaluation procedures for promotion are the same as those set forth in section III.D.6.a-c, g-o, and q-r of Appendix 3 to the ART Policy, with the following exceptions: a. References to tenure shall not apply. b. The Clinical Evaluation Committee shall be substituted for the department PTRM committee. c. Departmental standards for Clinical Faculty (as described in Section D.3. above) shall be substituted for department PTRM documents. d. As provided in the evaluation procedures referenced in E. 3. above, the Clinical Evaluation Committee and the Department Chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion. If the department level recommendation is favorable, the College PTRM Committee and the Dean make recommendations regarding the promotion.

2. To Professor

a. The minimum years in rank as specified by the University.

b. Excellence and commitment to teaching, demonstrated by teaching effectiveness at a level at least as high as Departmental norms and by continued commitment to course and Department development.

c. Significant body of scholarly or professional work,

d. Distinguished record of service to the Department, College, and University that includes leadership roles,
e. Satisfactory performance in all other areas specified under Standards and Criteria B through H above

f. Promotion to Clinical Professor

Clinical Faculty at all ranks (except Clinical Professor) are eligible for review for promotion. The minimum number of years in rank is ten years for Clinical Professor.

VI. CALENDAR

The Department of Family Studies and Community Development will abide by the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar as published in Appendix 3 of the ART policy. The calendar is included in this document as Appendix A, pg.35 with the understanding that if the published university calendar changes, the FMST calendar may change without formal amendment of the FMST Policies and Procedures document.
APPENDIX A

Department of Family Studies and Community Development

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 an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

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

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

August 1 (USM mandated)
Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member’s appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a 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.
B. The college PTRM committee’s report with vote counts and recommendations and the
dean’s recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

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

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

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

The First Friday in February

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

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

The Second Friday in February

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

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

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

March 1
First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the university President.

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

Third Friday in March
Provost’s letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTRM committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.
Classroom Observation Template

Instructor’s Name:
Observer’s Name:
Number and Course Title:
Date of Classroom Observation:
Number of students enrolled: In attendance:

Type of class:
- □ Class Discussion
- □ Student Presentations
- □ Group work
- □ Lecture
- □ Seminar
- □ Other (please describe below)

In-Class Observations

1. Knowledge of the subject:

   Excellent  Good  Needs Improvement  Unable to Observe

Comment on the instructor’s content knowledge for this session. Use the prompts below to guide your thinking.

   Did s/he explain ideas clearly?
   Did s/he seem well-prepared?
   Was s/he able to answer questions posed by the students?
2. **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unable to Observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment on the class session’s organization. Use the prompts below to guide your thinking.

Did the instructor:
- Identify a central purpose for that session?
- Maintain the focus on that central purpose throughout the class?
- Clarify major points?
- Manage class time well (to avoid feeling rushed)?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unable to Observe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment on the instructor’s teaching methods. Use the prompts below to guide your thinking.

- How would you describe the instructor’s classroom manner and presence?
- Did this instructor introduce pedagogical innovations that you found noteworthy? If so, which?
- Did the instructor check for student understanding of the material periodically?
- Did the instructor encourage broad participation?
- Did the instructor encourage / give opportunities for critical thinking/debate about the subject matter?
4. **Academic Rigor**: To what degree did the classroom activities and assignments meet the intellectual expectations of a course at this level? To what degree did the faculty member encourage critical thinking and careful reasoning?

   Excellent                     Good                  Needs Improvement        Unable to Observe

*Comment on the academic rigor of the course in general, and for this session. Use the prompts below to guide your thinking.*

   - Are course activities thoughtful and well-connected to course objectives and learning outcomes?
   - Are grading rubrics used for course activities appropriate for the assignment and level of the course?
   - Are the grade distributions for course activities consistent with department expectations for the level of course?

5. **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.)?

   Excellent                     Good                  Needs Improvement        Unable to Observe

*Comment on student engagement. Use the prompts below to guide your thinking.*

   - How many students used laptops/IPads for note taking?
   - Did most of the students appear intellectually engaged?
   - What means did most of the students use to take notes?
   - Did students ask meaningful questions?
Were students often distracted (cell phone use, Facebook, etc.)? How did the instructor respond to these issues, if at all?

**Syllabus-Required Information**

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

- [ ] Course name and number
- [ ] Instructor information (name, email address, telephone and office numbers)
- [ ] Text[s] required including bibliographic information
- [ ] Brief description of course content
- [ ] Learning Outcomes Statement
- [ ] Assignments and requirements
- [ ] Grading procedures
- [ ] Attendance policy (including lateness)
- [ ] Plagiarism policy
- [ ] Policy for students with special needs
- [ ] Statement that the course can be repeated only once without permission of the Academic Standards Committee.
- [ ] A week-by-week or session-by-session calendar

Comment on any other information included or missing from the syllabus related to effectively communicating expectations and requirements.

Attach the syllabus and any additional materials supplied by the instructor (written assignments, handouts, etc.)

**Conference with Instructor**

The observation process and form are meant to serve both an evaluative and a mentoring purpose. The post-observation conference should be a dialogue between observer and the
observed faculty member. Comment on your post-observation conference with the instructor. When did you meet? Briefly list any relevant information that came up in your discussions with the instructor.

Observer’s Signature

Instructor’s Signature

Date Completed and Submitted to the Department
APPENDIX B-2

Peer Teaching Evaluation Process

All tenured, tenure track, clinical, lecturer, faculty must have peer teaching evaluations conducted on a regular basis as outlined in the University, College, and Departmental PTRM documents. Adjunct faculty must be observed annually. The peer teaching evaluation is intended to be an evaluative process, as well as provide an opportunity for faculty being observed to receive constructive feedback to improve teaching effectiveness.

**Pre-Visit Preparation.** The Peer evaluator and faculty member schedule the time and date of the peer evaluation. This information should be shared with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee so that it can be recorded. Before the agreed upon date the peer evaluator should review course syllabus and the course Blackboard site for course objectives, teaching, and assessment methods.

**Peer Evaluation Visit.** For the class evaluation, the evaluator should attend an entire class period. Upon completion of the visit, the faculty member conducting the observation should complete the peer evaluation. A thorough written evaluation should include strengths as well as suggestions for alternative ways to improve teaching.

**Post Evaluation Meeting.** The Peer evaluator and faculty member should arrange to meet following the class visit to discuss the prepared peer evaluation. Both faculty members sign the peer evaluation form. Copies of the peer evaluation form should be given to the faculty member and the Department Chair. Observed faculty should include the evaluation in their Annual Review and Tenure materials.
APPENDIX C

Clinical Faculty Scholarship/Administrative Ability/Accomplishments

Administrative Ability: demonstrates administrative aptitude in processes and procedures

Administrative Accomplishment: demonstrated proficiency in creating and/or substantial enhancing/developing administrative procedures to advance the department’s clinical processes

- Leadership associated with department internship, service learning and community partner activities
- Oversight of all sequential department developed field work courses (FMST 297 Preparing Human Service Workers: Pre-Internship, FMST 397 Internship in Family and Human Services and FMST 497 Advanced Internship in Family Studies and Community Development)
- Student Development including Managing Student Issues Related to Field Work and Field Work Courses
- Community Engagement and Collaboration
- Maintaining a high level of Clinical/Professional Excellence

Below are examples of activities in each area:

- **Leadership associated with all department internship, service learning and community partner engagement activities**
  - Facilitate bimonthly department internship committee meetings
  - Facilitate longer working meetings at least twice a year
  - Manage assessment related to the learning outcome(s) related to field based courses
  - Work with internship team to distribute various administrative responsibilities

- **Oversight of all sequential department developed field work courses (FMST 297 Preparing Human Service Workers: Pre-Internship, FMST 397 Internship in Family and Human Services and FMST 497 Advanced Internship in Family Studies and Community Development)**
  - Recommend and implement curriculum/ course changes
  - Enhance field work curriculum with technology consistent with professional preparation
  - Prepare and submit curricular changes/ additions to curriculum committee
  - Develop course syllabi and BlackBoard Sites for use by all department instructors
  - Collaborate and mentor instructors teaching the courses
    - Ensures consistency among all faculty teaching field work courses

- **Student Development including Managing Student Issues Related to Field Work and Field Work Courses**
  - Manage Out of Sequence FMST 297 students: update out of sequence student list, review updated preapproval documents, support student in internship site selection process
  - Request student professional liability documentation
  - Oversee field placement of FMST 397 and FMST 497 students
  - Manage FMST 297 Internship Preapproval Process: review FMST 297 preapproval documents, review internship candidates with FMST faculty for potential internship challenges, meet with identified students
  - Manage, in coordination with department chair and administrative assistant, permit process for FMST 297, FMST 397 and FMST 497
  - Review field work policies at least annually and recommend changes and/or additions as needed.
  - Counsel students involved in field work site issues
• **Community Engagement and Collaboration**
  
  o **Managing all facets of internship site affiliations**
    - Identify deficiencies in approved internship site list/ seek to fill deficient areas
    - Coordinate vetting of new sites including administrative duties: communication with student/site and document archiving
    - Review site list at least annually and remove inactive and uninterested sites
    - Develop affiliation agreements
    - Review field work handbook at least annually and make revision as needed
    - Communicate closely with site supervisors when handling student issues
    - Manage the internship site student evaluation process
  
  o **Agency Collaboration**
    - Coordinate or participate in the coordination of yearly advisory board meetings
    - Coordinate Panel of Professionals (Fall/Spring semesters)
    - Coordinate Risk Management workshop (Spring)
    - Participate in campus-wide internship committees
    - Support department sponsored workshops (Disability Awareness workshop and Leukemia Lymphoma workshop)

• **Maintaining a high level of Clinical/Professional Excellence**
  
  o **As per V. C. 3 in the university document**, “Scholarship should be closely related to the clinical areas of expertise and responsibilities.”
    - Maintaining licensure
    - Obtaining training in clinical practice
    - Providing information to professionals via workshops, trainings, or conference presentations
    - Practicing in the community
    - Serving on Boards in the community or in professional organizations
**BALLOT**

**DEPARTMENT MERIT RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Evaluation of Activities for Academic Year

June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2020

Faculty member being evaluated____________________ Rank______

Department of_____________________________________

Faculty member casting this ballot: ID#____________ Date________

Check one level of merit under each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching/Advising</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Scholarship*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Meritorious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (Base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (Base +1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**OVERALL MERIT RECOMMENDATION** (check only one):

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Meritorious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (Base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (Base +1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a secret ballot as directed by the

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

(Appendix 3: III.A.5)
Appendix D -2

DEPARTMENT SUMMARY MERIT RECOMMENDATION

Based on Evaluation of Activities for Academic Year

June 1, 20___ to May 31, 20___

Faculty member evaluated: ______________________ Rank ______________________

Department of ____________________________

Signature Dept. Merit Committee Chair: _______________ Date __________

Department Merit Committee Total Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching/Advising</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Meritorious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (Base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (Base +1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERALL MERIT RECOMMENDATION (check only one category)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Meritorious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (Base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (Base +1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature 1</th>
<th>Signature 2</th>
<th>Signature 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D -3

Summary Merit Recommendation Report

FMST Year_______

Instructions: This form is a consolidation of the merit committee members’ individual ballots for each faculty member that is being considered for the year. It shows whether the committee found their materials for teaching, scholarship, and service to be Not Satisfactory (NS), Satisfactory (S) or Excellent (E), and whether they are eligible for No merit, Base merit or Base plus merit.

Four faculty members can be chosen for Base Plus Merit based on eligibility and deliberation by the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>No Merit</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Base Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member's name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>SERVICE</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

I confirm that I have seen this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Department of Family Studies and Community Development

Examples Indicating Excellent/ Base Plus Merit Performance

Examples of Teaching and Advising that may indicate Excellent/ Base Plus Merit performance include, but are not limited to:

a. achievement of a significant internal or external instructional grant or fellowship
b. development, implementation, and assessment of a program to enhance department advising and/or department developed courses or curriculum
c. supervision of student research projects that earn distinction outside the department.
d. unusual validation of teaching, such as a Regent’s Award or Student Government Award
e. new course development requiring substantial continuing education and serving the needs of the department
f. new course published in university catalog

Examples of Scholarship for tenure track faculty that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include, but are not limited to:

a. accepted publication of research, theoretical paper, or case study in a peer-reviewed journal
b. publication of a significant applied work of scholarship in one’s field of expertise
c. award of a significant external grant or Fellowship
d. publication of a peer-reviewed book or book chapter

Examples of Scholarship for clinical and lecturer faculty that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include those listed above with the addition of:

a. publication or printed dissemination of a model program/ project developed
within the current faculty role or clinical practice.
b. presentations at national, state, or regional conferences
c. participation in professional organizations on boards, committees, and leadership roles
d. extraordinary development of community collaboration relationships/project that enhances departmental and University reputation in the field.
e. unusual validation of clinical practice such as an award of regional and national recognition.
f. extraordinary development of department program or procedure that is identified as a department need and benefits the clinical/human service arm of the department.

g. For lecturers only- maintenance of disciplinary and teaching currency as defined by the Faculty Policy on the Employment of Lecturers (02-01.05)

Examples of Service that may indicate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance include, but are not limited to:

a. extraordinary service to the University, College, Department, Community, Governmental or Professional organization that requires significant time or a major project that exceeds the allowable workload percentage.
b. development or significant revision of an academic or institutional program
c. lead responsibility for the organization of major professional conference or a major conference related to one’s field of one’s professional expertise
d. assuming the leadership of a major University or College committee or task force
e. assuming the uncompensated leadership of a non-profit community organization.