Department of Special Education
Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Document

Departmental Approval 05.31.11
College Approval 06.20.11
University Approval 07.28.11
Departmental Revisions 12.03.12
College Approval of Revisions 12.03.12

This document will be reviewed and revised as needed.

Unless the revisions are major, significant, and/or multiple changes, approval will be determined by a majority of the College PTRM committee. If the scope or content of the revisions is otherwise, the document shall be submitted to a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty for approval.

Table of Contents

Department of Special Education Promotion and Tenure Document

Note: It is the responsibility of each faculty member to adhere to the Department of Special Education, College of Education, and Towson University policies and procedures for each level of review.

I. Standards

A. Standards for all Department of Special Education Faculty

All faculty members in the Department of Special Education are expected to:

1. Demonstrate commitment to teaching and to the delivery of quality instruction.
2. Prepare well-organized syllabi, examinations, and other course materials.
3. Maintain high standards of instruction using a variety of materials, including appropriate technology.
4. Be responsive to cultural and individual differences.
5. Provide effective instruction as measured by both student and peer evaluations.
6. Be accessible to students and provide accurate advising.
7. Refine and update the courses one teaches.
8. Keep current in the knowledge base within one's field.
9. Interact with other professionals in one's field both internally and externally.
10. Be involved in the institution's faculty governance at the program and department levels.

Promotion and tenure are dependent on a formal review of each faculty member's performance in three main categories. These are *Teaching* (including advising)*, Scholarship,* and *Service*. As parts of a whole, each category allows faculty opportunities to demonstrate their ability to contribute to the overall mission of the University, the College of Education, and more specifically, to the mission of the Department of Special Education.

Defining Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

<u>Teaching</u>

Teaching is the primary mission of Towson University and the primary responsibility of each faculty member. Faculty members are expected to model exemplary teaching practices and should be rated as excellent in this area. As described in *Appendix 3* to the *Towson University Policy on Appointment Rank and Tenure of Faculty*, teaching performance will be evaluated from the following evidence submitted by the candidate:

- Peer evaluations;
- Student course evaluations;
- Self-evaluation; and,
- Course materials.

Advising

Academic advising is another component of excellence in the overall category of teaching. While the process of advising differs between undergraduate and graduate programs all advisors are expected to:

- Be accessible to assist students with academic questions;
- Be knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures;
- Provide accurate and timely information to students; and,
- Be professional in relating to students.

Scholarship

"University scholarship is scholarship that fulfills the mission of the University, in particular, the unit with which the faculty member is affiliated and utilizes the academic or professional expertise of the faculty member" (UniSCOPE, 2000, p. 2). As the "State's Metropolitan University*"* with "certification and professional development of educators" central to the University's future *(Towson University Mission Statement),* we define and articulate scholarship relative to the University's mission, and specifically as scholarship pertains to the unique roles and responsibilities of the Department of Special Education faculty.

Utilizing UniSCOPE (2000) as a guiding framework scholarship can be defined as

> …the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge … informed by current knowledge in the field and [is] characterized by creativity and openness to new information, debate, and criticism. For scholarly activity to be recognized, utilized, and rewarded, it must be shared with others in appropriate ways. (p. 2)

Articulated within Appendix 3 the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (ART Policy) are four forms of scholarship that guide our work in the Department of Special Education. Further elaboration on the four Forms of Scholarship can be found in the College of Education P&T document.

Table 1: Four Forms of Scholarship

Forms of Scholarship	Definition
Scholarship of Application	applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the university, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts
Scholarship of Discovery	traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts
Scholarship of Integration	applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines;
Scholarship of Teaching	exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning

In Table 2, examples of activities and products for each form of scholarship are provided. This list is not inclusive of all products that faculty may use for the evaluation of scholarship, and faculty are encouraged to add products that they deem relevant to their work.

Table 2: Sample activities and products embedded within scholarship

Form of Scholarship	Sample Activities	Sample Products
Scholarship of Application: applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the university	• School consulting • State/LEA consulting • Applied research in university settings • Applied research in school settings, including Professional Development Schools (PDS) • Training/Consulting collaboratively with the community, a cluster of schools, a school system, a university/college, etc.	• Presentations to committees or groups • Workshops for schools and community groups • Accreditation report • New program development • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Materials developed in support of MSDE committee work (new courses, standards, etc.) • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Evaluation of a university/college, school system program or grant including scholarship of another individual's work.
Scholarship of Discovery: traditional research, including knowledge for its own sake	• Basic research • Evaluation research • Review, critique, or synthesis of existing research	• Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants and contracts awarded • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Presentations at conferences
Scholarship of Integration: applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines	• Multi-disciplinary/ cross-department research/study	• Publication of book • Publication of a chapter in a book • Publication of articles in refereed journals (print or on-line) • Publication in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries
Scholarship of Teaching: exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning	• Teacher research of one's own teaching and student learning • Writing an accreditation report	• Materials/Publications designed to reach an audience of practitioners, parents, students, or other members of the community • New program development • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Overseeing the development of new cohort groups • Designing and/or providing materials for adjunct faculty on and off campus • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries.

Service

Faculty members are responsible for service to the University (which includes the college and department), their discipline, and the broader community including collaborations and partnerships with practitioners in the field. Service may also include civic service 'that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the University's mission' (ART Document, p. 14). It is expected that Department of Special Education faculty demonstrate their commitment to service as documented by activities such as:

- Membership on department, college, and university committees and task forces;
- Leadership positions in the department, college, and university governance structure;
- Involvement in the work of practitioners in one's field;

- Involvement in Professional Development Schools;
- Involvement in professional organizations and associations in one's field at the state, regional, national, or international level; and,
- Service to community associations.

Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Overview of Annual Review and Reappointment

All Department of Special Education faculty, tenured and tenure-track, shall be evaluated annually according to the procedures and criteria described herein. All deliberations in any evaluation process will be kept confidential (see Appendix C).

All faculty, programs, departments, and colleges shall abide by both the USM and the Towson University Annual Review and Reappointment (Section VI). The processes, procedures, and cycle for all evaluations (annual, reappointment) shall follow the general and appropriate specific policies described herein.

All faculty shall complete the current version of the Annual Report (AR) and Workload Agreement, (see Section VII) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. The Department of Special Education Chairperson shall assist continuing faculty with the development and approval of the Workload Agreement. Such workload expectations shall be aligned with department, college and university goals based on the department, college and university missions and visions.

Each fall, an Annual Review shall be completed for each tenured and tenure-track faculty member holding a full-time contract. It shall be included in the evaluation portfolio.

The Department of Special Education Chairperson shall comply with the Towson University Annual Review, and ensure that evaluation portfolios meet all format requirements.

Documentation and Material: The Evaluation Portfolio

The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review and reappointment rests with the faculty member.

Guided by the chairperson 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.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review and reappointment contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the Department of Special Education, College of Education, and University criteria.

1. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder.

2. 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 and II) Forms;

b. current *Curriculum vitae*;

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 and service.

f. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

Timeline for Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

The Third Friday in September
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.
(The faculty member or his/her chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar.)

The Second Friday in October
Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October
The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

Process for Merit Review

Annual Review for Merit

The Department P&T Committee shall annually review faculty for merit as appropriate.

In conjunction with guidelines issued by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty or section AR II of the Annual Report form shall serve as the basis for merit evaluation. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their Annual Report.

Each faculty member shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during the academic year, to which the evaluation applies as outlined in the section ―Documentation and Material Inclusion (below). The faculty member shall submit the evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson no later than the third Friday in June.

The annual review for merit shall be conducted and completed no later than during the fall semester following the academic calendar year under review. The Department Chairperson shall be responsible for presenting to the Department Merit Committee all the evaluation portfolios for all faculty members in the department.

The Department Chairperson shall not be a voting member of the Department Merit Committee.

All votes regarding merit shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Committee Chairperson. The Committee Chairperson shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

The Department Merit Committee shall evaluate these evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the Department P&T document) and submitted to the Department Chairperson no later than the second Friday in October.

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

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

The Department Chairperson and a representative of the Department Merit Committee shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the faculty member's Annual Report, the student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the Department Merit Committee recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation.

The Department Merit Committee Chairperson shall forward the evaluation portfolio, Merit Committee and Chairperson recommendations and the vote count record to the dean's office by the second Friday in November.

By the first Friday in February, the dean shall review the department recommendations and forward them to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall notify the Department Chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the second Friday in February.

Faculty may appeal a negative recommendation for merit at any point in the process, following the procedures outlined below; however, the appeal shall not stay the merit review process.

The Provost shall review and approve or deny merit recommendations. The Provost's decision on merit is final; there is no appeal from the Provost's decision.

Composition of Merit Committee

Committee membership of up to seven (7) faculty will be determined as follows:

a. One full professor will be elected.
b. One associate professor will be elected.
c. One assistant professor will be elected.
d. One full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member.
e. One department member (tenure or non-tenure track) will be elected at large.
f. The Department Chairperson (as a non-voting member).

Membership on the Merit Committee is for one year. A majority consists of 50%, plus one, of the voting members present. In case a vacancy is created on the Merit Committee, an election will be held at the next department meeting to fill the vacancy until the original member returns.

Standards and Criteria Used in Evaluation of Faculty Performance

There are three (3) categories of merit as follows:

- **Not Meritorious**: Performance fails to meet standards adequately.
- **Satisfactory (Base Merit)**: Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the Department, College, and University.
- **Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit)**: Excellence in teaching, and satisfactory or higher performance for scholarship and service.

The Department of Special Education recommends merit in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Teaching

Judgments of *excellence* or *satisfactory* in teaching will be made holistically, using where appropriate, the review of the faculty member's:

- peer evaluations
- student evaluations of teaching
- review of syllabi and other instructional materials
- student evaluations of advising
- new instructional procedures
- co-teaching responsibilities
- course lead responsibilities
- mentorship of others in teaching
- correlational statement on teaching

2. Scholarship

Satisfactory

Scholarship activities, such as the following, will be considered evidence of *Satisfactory* performance:

- submitted a proposal or paper for possible presentation or publication
- submitted a proposal for a grant or award to an external agency
- collected and analyzed data for a future presentation/paper
- attended professional conference(s) related to his/her expertise
- other –as approved by the Merit Committee

Excellent

- acceptance of a peer reviewed article, chapter, or book for publication
- acceptance of a peer-reviewed presentation at an international/national conference
- received a grant or award from an external/internal agency
- served on the editorial board of a state, regional, or national publication
- served as reviewer of peer-reviewed publication or international/national conference proposals
- mentored others in scholarship
- authored or played a major role in the development of a Department, College, or University document (e.g. accreditation document, PTRM document, white paper)
- played a major role in developing or revising a program for the University, College, or Department
- other (Evidence of advanced performance in scholarship)—as approved by the Merit Committee

3. Service

Satisfactory

- served actively on Department, College, University or community committees or advisory groups that advance the mission of Department, College, and/or University
- volunteered to perform tasks, as requested by the Department Chair or a Departmental committee chair, needed to improve or continue Departmental programs

Excellent

- chaired or directed an active committee, advisory group, or program (not part of assigned time) that advances the mission of the Department, College, and/or University or related to one's areas of expertise
- served effectively as faculty advisor for a Towson student group
- served as an executive of a professional organization directly related to one's areas of expertise
- served actively on a Professional Development School governance committee
- served as a member of a committee of a professional organization directly related to one's area of expertise

- conducted ongoing professional consulting relationships with a given entity
- received recognition of high distinction for service
- mentored others in service
- Other (Evidence of advanced performance in service) – as approved by the Merit

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding merit shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTRM calendar.

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

There are three (3) types of appeals.

Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either Department Merit Committee, the Department Chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person, to the dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

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

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

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

Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM committee.

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

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson, the Department Merit Committee Chairperson, the dean and the University PTRM committee Chairperson.

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

Recommendations of the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The Chairperson of the University PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for merit rests with the faculty member. The annual review evaluation portfolio is utilized to determine level of merit to be awarded.

Guided by the chairperson 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.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for merit contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's Department and College criteria. (See the above section on Annual Review for documentation to include.)

During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or his/her chairperson participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in September.

The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

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. The Dean will send a copy to the Department chairperson of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

If the Department 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 (see Section VII). A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

Copies of the Chairperson's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

Timeline for Merit Review

The First Friday in May
Department Merit Committees are formed.

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

The Third Friday in September
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.

The Second Friday in October
Department Merit Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October
The Department Chairperson may place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. The Department Merit 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 Merit Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department Merit Committee Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

The First Friday in February
The dean shall review the Department Merit Committee recommendations and forward them to the Provost.

The Second Friday in February
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 last known address.

Promotion and Tenure Process

By the third Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member intends to submit material for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the Chairperson of the department of his/her intention.

By the fourth Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member is to undergo tenure or promotion, the Department Chairperson shall notify all members of the department of those intentions and shall confirm those intentions to the dean and the Provost.

The Department P&T Committee shall evaluate faculty for tenure and/or promotion.

All tenured faculty members in the Department shall be members of the Department P&T Committee. A quorum must be established at each Department P&T Committee meeting. A quorum shall be a majority of the voting members. If a Committee member is on sabbatical or other leave, s/he may only vote if s/he has attended all of the Department P&T Committee meetings for deliberations.

The Department P&T Committee shall review evaluation portfolios for promotion and/or tenure and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the Department P&T document) and submitted to the Department Chairperson by the second Friday in October.

All votes regarding Promotion and/or Tenure shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Committee Chairperson. The Committee Chairperson shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee's recommendations to the next level of review.

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

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

The Department P&T Committee Chairperson shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record to the dean's office by the second Friday in November, where they will be available to members of the College P&T Committee.

The College P&T Committee shall consider the Evaluation Record relative to tenure and/or promotion. It shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The

statement with recommendation and vote count shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and submitted to the dean by the first Friday in January.

The dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to each faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the third Friday in January.

The recommendations of the College P&T Committee and the dean shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the third Friday in January. Copies also shall be sent to the Department Chairperson and the Department P&T Committee Chairperson. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The dean shall forward the summative portfolio for each faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure to the Provost by the first Friday in February.

The Provost may ask the dean, the Department Chairperson, or the Department and/or College P&T Committee for additional information from the lengthier evaluation portfolio prior to making a final recommendation. The Provost shall prepare a substantive letter of recommendation regarding tenure to be sent to the faculty member, Department and College P&T Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, dean of the college and the President by the third Friday in March. A copy of this letter will be filed with the faculty member's official file maintained by the Office of the Provost.

In the event of a negative recommendation at any level of review, the faculty member may choose to challenge the recommendation through the appeals process; however, an appeal will not stay the evaluation process.

The awarding of tenure and/or promotion shall be made only by the President.

Tenure and/or promotion shall be effective on the date indicated in the official letter containing the President's decision.

Materials for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

The responsibility for presenting material for promotion and tenure rests with the faculty member.

Guided by the chairperson 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.

Evaluation portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I and II) Forms;
- current *Curriculum vitae*
- syllabi of courses taught
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:

-- student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department Chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
-- grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect (2010-2011);
-- documentation of scholarship and service;
-- 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.

If at any level 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.

Copies of the Department Chairperson's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The P&T committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion and tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder labeled and indexed as follows:

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

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

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

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

Section V
- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form;

- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson;
- Written recommendation of the College P&T Committee; and,
- Written recommendation of the academic dean.

Additional Documentation Responsibilities

The dean of the college shall assure that the summative portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.

The dean of the college shall have the responsibility of returning the supporting material to the Department Chairperson who shall then retain it for three (3) years following the date of the decision to grant or deny promotion or tenure. The materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

Standards for Promotion

This section outlines the standards for promotion and/or advancement to tenure. Each faculty member is responsible for showcasing his/her best work in each area of review: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. While excellence in teaching is paramount for successful promotion and tenure review at Towson University, without evidence of scholarship and the establishment of a scholarly agenda, tenure and promotion will not be granted. Table 3 outlines the standards from promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

Assistant Professor: The appointee shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research and in areas in which there is a critical shortage of doctorates. The appointee should also show potential for superior teaching, service, and research, scholarship, or where applicable, creative performance, commensurate with the University's mission.

Associate Professor: In addition to having the qualifications of an assistant professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and successful experience in research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of seven years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research. There shall also be evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession.

Professor: In addition to having the qualifications of an associate professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and, where appropriate to the mission of Towson University, a national reputation. The appointee shall have a minimum of ten years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for faculty who have attained national distinction for comparable professional activity or research. There shall be continuing evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession.

Faculty will be guided by the expectations of teaching, scholarship, and service as *articulated by all levels: university, college, and department.*

Table 3: College of Education Standards for Promotion and Tenure Advancement

	Promotion to Associate Professor and Advancement with Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Teaching	• Excellent student evaluations • Excellent peer evaluations • Excellent course syllabi and instructional materials • Excellent evaluation of advising by students	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • Mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in teaching and advising.
Service	• A sustained record of quality service to the university, college, department, community, and/or profession.	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • Leadership in service to the university, college, and/or department. • Leadership in service to the profession.
Scholarship	• Evidence of a programmatic anchor(s) for his/her scholarship • A sustained record of quality scholarship, including but not limited to, peer-reviewed conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications/successful grants	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • Evidence of local, regional, national, or international expertise/reputation

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the P&T review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTRM calendar.

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

There are three (3) types of appeals.

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either department and/or College P&T Committees, the Department Chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

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

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

Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson and the Department P&T Chairperson. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean and the College P&T Committee.

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

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

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

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

   Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM committee.

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

   Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson, the Department P&T Chairperson, the dean and the University PTRM committee Chairperson. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean, the College P&T Committee, the Department Chairperson, and the University PTRM committee Chairperson. Appeals of Provost recommendations shall be copied to the dean and Department Chairperson.

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

   Recommendations of the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President, whose decision shall be final. The Chairperson of the University PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 ―Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

The President's decision on tenure and promotion shall be final.

Timeline for the Promotion and Tenure Process

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.
Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on Department P&T Committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and dean.

The First Friday in September
Department Chairperson approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department P&T Committee.

The Third Friday in September
Faculty notify Department Chairperson of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
College P&T Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's P&T Committee (if necessary).
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.35.

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

The Second Friday in October
Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October
Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for promotion and tenure review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
The Department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
The Department P&T 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Committee Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

The First Friday in January
The College P&T Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

The Third Friday in January
The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
The College P&T Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

The First Friday in February
The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the College P&T Committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure to the Provost.
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 Third Friday in March
Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College P&T committee chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and dean of the college.

Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

Aside from simply showcasing teaching, scholarship, and service, each candidate will attend to the following items that are embedded within these categories. Failure to do so may result in an unfavorable review.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Tenure track faculty are required to show evidence of peer review of their teaching. The general process is as follows:

1. **Peer visitations for formative purposes**.
   All faculty are encouraged to invite other members to observe his/her teaching and to provide him/her with written and/or oral comments as helpful feedback.

2. **Peer visitations for evaluative purposes**.

   All faculty must be observed regularly.

   The Department P&T Committee will approve the peers selected for the review.

   a. Non-tenured, tenure track faculty must be observed a minimum of two times per academic year. Observations will be conducted by two different tenured COE faculty.

   b. tenured faculty must be observed to meet the requirements of the next level of review.

3. **Peer Visitation**

   a. A pre-observation conference between the faculty member and the observer will be held so that the faculty member can discuss the class session to be observed. This may include class goals, objectives, and activities.

   b. Following the class session, the observer must write a summary reaction and submit it to the instructor observed. The faculty member has the right to determine if s/he intends to have this review included in his/her Promotion and Tenure and/or Merit documents or have another observation. It is suggested that the summary reaction contain references to the following qualities:

      1. Organization or structure of the lesson
      2. Clarity of instruction
      3. Rapport with class
      4. Professional competence

   c. A post-observation conference should take place within **two** weeks of the observation. This will allow for an open exchange prior to the final writing of the review.

   d. A faculty member may design an individual observation form, which s/he may ask visiting colleagues to use in evaluating his/her teaching.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty are required to show evidence of student review of their teaching. The general process is as follows:

- All faculty are evaluated at the end of each teaching semester.
- Students complete the Towson University student evaluation form online.
- The data and summative report become part of the faculty's evaluation portfolio to be considered for review.

Evaluation of Advising

Advisors are expected to:

- Be accessible to assist students with academic questions;
- Be knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures;
- Provide accurate and timely information to students; and,
- Be professional in relating to students.

A sample advising evaluation form is provided in Appendix A.

The Department of Special Education will provide an opportunity for students to evaluate their advisors, at least annually.

Faculty Support

It is the responsibility of the Department Chairperson to support a working plan for the faculty member's promotion. This includes:

1. Providing a teaching schedule and required service responsibilities that allow the instructor to protect time for scholarship; and,
2. Meeting each semester with the faculty member in order to review and counsel him/her on perceived progress in developing a sustained record of scholarship.

First Year Faculty

All first-year tenure-track faculty, in collaboration with the Department Chairperson, shall complete the form "Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty, (SENTF)" (see Section VII) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described herein. The Department Chairperson shall append to the SENTF form the following materials:

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

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review and reappointment rests with the faculty member.

Guided by the chairperson 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.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review and reappointment contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally shall include:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
  - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department Chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
  - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- documentation of scholarship and service.
- peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

Reappointment: First Year Faculty

The Department P&T Committee shall evaluate each new faculty member's first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment and merit.

Each faculty member shall prepare an evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during his/her first semester. The evaluation portfolio must include the Standards and Expectations of New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form. In addition, 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.

The Department P&T Committee shall review the evaluation portfolio and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The recommendation should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations.

The Department Chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member and to the dean, inclusive of the Department Chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The dean shall review the Evaluation Record and forward it to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall notify the Department Chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

Non-reappointment recommendations will be delivered to the Provost.

- A faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals section (Section V); however, an appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

- If the Provost accepts the non-reappointment recommendation, written notice shall either be delivered to the faculty member or mailed to the faculty member's last known address by March 1; otherwise, the appointment is renewed automatically for one (1) additional year.

Timeline for First Year Review

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

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

The First Friday in January
The Department P&T Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Third Friday in January
The Department P&T Committee and Chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.
Department Chairperson recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The Second Friday in February
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.

Reappointment of Second Year Faculty

The Department P&T Committee shall evaluate second year tenure-track faculty and make a recommendation regarding reappointment.

The Department Chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation for each faculty member reviewed for reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson should be forwarded by the Department P&T Committee Chairperson to the dean's office.

The dean shall review the Evaluation Record of second year faculty and forward it to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with a department recommendation, the dean shall notify the Department Chairperson and the faculty member of the recommendation in writing. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated including: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The dean shall be responsible for adding this recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

If the Provost accepts the non-reappointment recommendation, written notice shall either be delivered to the faculty member or mailed to the faculty member's last known address; otherwise, the appointment is renewed automatically for one (1) additional year.

A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in the Appeals section (Section V) of this document; however, an appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

Timeline for Second Year Review

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

The Third Friday in September
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.

The Fourth Friday in October
Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The Department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
The Department P&T 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

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

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.

Reappointment of Third through Fifth Year Faculty

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

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

The evaluation shall occur pursuant to the schedule established by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the Department P&T Committee. The evaluation process shall include: the Department P&T Committee's recommendation; the Department Chairperson's recommendation, if any, the dean's recommendation, and, the Provost's final decision.

The faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment recommendation to the next highest level in the evaluation process; however, there shall be no appeal from the Provost's decision, which is final.

Timeline for Third through Fifth Year Review

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

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

The Fourth Friday in October
Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The Department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
The Department P&T 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

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

The First Friday in February
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.

Third-Year Review

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

The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the Department's P&T committee.

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

- must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and,

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

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

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

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

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

All documentation is due to the Department Chairperson.

Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chairperson and the Department P&T Committee Chairperson. The written report will be shared with the dean.

Documentation for Third Year Review

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review (includes annual review and third-year review) contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and Department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process.

Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
    - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
    - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- documentation of scholarship and service.

Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:

- all of the items listed above; and,
- peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

- Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:
    - all of the items listed above;
    - syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
    - student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year; and,
    - 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.

Timeline for Third Year Review

The Third Friday in June
All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

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

The Third Friday in September
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.35.

The Second Friday in October
Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October
Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
The Department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
The Department P&T 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

The Third Friday in January
All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson.

The First Friday in February
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.

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

Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Review

Overview of Comprehensive Review

General information regarding University System of Maryland (USM) policy on evaluation may be found in the Board of Regents - II-1.00 University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II100.html) and the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (http://inside.towson.edu/generalcampus/tupolicies/categorylist.cfm?thecategory=Faculty).

All faculty, tenured and tenure-track, shall be evaluated annually according to the procedures and criteria described herein.

All deliberations pertaining to comprehensive review at all levels shall be confidential.

All faculty, programs, departments, and colleges shall abide by both the USM and the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendars (Section VI**).** The processes, procedures, and cycle for comprehensive review shall follow the general and appropriate specific policies described herein.

The Department Chairperson shall comply with the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar and ensure that evaluation portfolios meet all format requirements.

The procedures and expectations for review set forth in this appendix may be amended from time to time.

Documentation and Material Inclusion

The responsibility for presenting material for the comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.

Guided by the Chairperson 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 her/his narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for comprehensive review contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents shall include:

- completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms for each of the five years under review;
- current *Curriculum vitae*;
- syllabi of courses taught during the five years under review;

- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, for the five years under review and including the following:

- student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department Chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;

- grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect Fall 2010;

- peer evaluations of teaching at least for the prior academic year;

- documentation of scholarship and service; and,

- a reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five years of his/ her work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or his/her Chairperson participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the Chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in September. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar.

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. The dean will send a copy to the Department Chairperson of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

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. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form (see Section VII). A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

Copies of the Chairperson's detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee's written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

In addition to the annual evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for comprehensive review shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. Plastic sheet protectors are not to be used. In each section of the binder, documents will cover the five years under review and shall be presented from the most-to-least recent year. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:

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

Section II
- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report (AR I & II) or Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR I & II) Forms.

Section III
- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office.
- Include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- A minimum of two peer teaching evaluations shall be included from the five years under review.

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
- Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee;
- Letter of evaluation from Department Chairperson; and,
- Letter of evaluation from academic dean.

Additional documentation responsibilities

- Binders that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the department.

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

- The dean of the college shall have the responsibility of returning the supporting material to the Department Chairperson who shall then retain it for three years. The materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

Process and Procedures for Comprehensive Reviews

Principles

The evaluation materials included shall be professional, understandable, well-organized and easy to follow.

Recommendations shall be supported by referring to the faculty member's performance in the categories considered. Each proceeding level of evaluator(s) shall take into account the recommendations of the preceding evaluator(s). Evaluators at each level shall make an independent judgment, however, based on the evaluation material submitted at that level.

The evaluation process requires the exercise of sound judgment, confidential deliberation, and knowledge of the university, its educational vision, mission and goals.

All votes regarding comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Committee Chairperson. The Committee Chairperson shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

In the event of a negative recommendation at any level of review, the faculty member may choose to challenge the recommendation through the appeals process.

In the event of a difference in recommendations at the department level (P&T Committee and Chairperson), the evaluation portfolio will be forwarded to the next level of review.

Documentation Development

For faculty evaluations, the full evaluation portfolio shall be assembled by the individual being considered for comprehensive review.

The faculty member about whom the recommendation is made shall review the evaluation portfolio at each level and indicate that all documents have been included at the time of the evaluation portfolio submission to the next level of review.

For every type of evaluation, 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.

In the event that a faculty member wishes to challenge any written administrator evaluation and/or committee recommendation, s/he may add to the file any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective of her/his performance.

All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material

inclusion process has been adhered to with respect to notifying the faculty member and adhering to the review process timeline as stipulated in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Calendar.

Document Storage

The Department Chairperson shall maintain a copy of all official documents concerning evaluation recommendations. Copies of all recommendations also shall be sent to the faculty member and the dean.

The dean shall forward the evaluation recommendation to the Provost.

The official file concerning recommendations for five-year comprehensive review shall be maintained by the Provost as Chief Academic Officer of the university.

Evaluation Procedures

Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

- The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.

- 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.

- The Department Chairperson, 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.

- Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed above.

- The Department P&T Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations and submitted to the Department Chairperson.

- The Department Chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

- The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Department committee, the written evaluation of the Department Chairperson, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the Department P&T Committee Chairperson to the dean's office.

- The dean shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.

- A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section.

- All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address.

- 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 Chairperson and the dean. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, Chairperson and dean.

- The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction or termination.

- Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.

- Chairpersons, as faculty members, are included in the comprehensive review process.

- Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" department.

Comprehensive Review Committee Structure, Policies, and Procedures

The Department P&T Committee shall make recommendations concerning comprehensive five-year review.

The Department Chairperson shall not serve as a voting member of the Department P&T Committee.

Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTRM calendar.

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

There are three (3) types of appeals:

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either the Department and/or College P&T Committees, the Department Chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

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

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

   Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson and the Department P&T Chairperson. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean and the College P&T Committee.

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

   Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the College P&T Committee, the University PTRM committee, or the Provost) shall

review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

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

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

   Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM committee.

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

   Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson, the Department P&T Chairperson, the dean and the University PTRM committee Chairperson. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean, the College P&T Committee, the Department Chairperson, and the University PTRM committee Chairperson. Appeals of Provost recommendations shall be copied to the dean and Department Chairperson.

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

   Recommendations of the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The Chairperson of the University PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 - Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

The President's decision on comprehensive five-year review shall be final.

Faculty Development Relative to PTRM Process

Because the goal of the faculty evaluation process is to enhance student learning and to address the mission and vision of the university, college and/or department, the university shall maintain a foundation of resources to support the faculty in its evaluation role, both as individuals and the evaluation structure.

Resources shall be supported university-wide through the Division of Academic Affairs and through other appropriate units, such as the Center for Instructional Advancement and Technology (CIAT), as well as through departmental and college-based programs.

Within the second semester of the academic year, the Office of the Provost shall provide a workshop addressing PTRM issues. Faculty members serving on university, college, and/or Department P&T Committees are expected to attend. Faculty members aspiring to serve on PTRM committees are encouraged and welcomed to attend regardless of their rank. Such workshops may address current national trends in evaluation issues and any changes in USM and

Towson institutional policies. A certificate of attendance will be provided. Faculty may include such certificate under university service in their annual evaluation portfolio.

Timeline for Comprehensive Review

The Third Friday in June
Eligible faculty members submit their comprehensive review portfolio to the Department Chairperson for review in the fall.

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

The Third Friday in September
Final date for faculty to add information to update their comprehensive review portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.

The Second Friday in October
Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October
Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
The Department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

The Department P&T 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 comprehensive review portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the dean's office.

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

The First Friday in February
The dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

Third Friday in March
Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College P&T Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and dean.

Appendix A

Department of Special Education Advising Evaluation Form

Advisor's Name: _____

Date: _____

I have contacted* my advisor _____times since beginning my program.

*Contact means e-mail, phone call, in person, or a note left in the advisor's mailbox.

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Always
1. My advisor is approachable and treated me in a courteous and professional manner.					
2. My advisor was knowledgeable about University and/or Departmental policies, services, and procedures.					
3. My advisor was available during posted office hours.					
4. My advisor was open to my questions and concerns.					
5. My advisor is someone I would recommend to other students.					

Written Responses (On back of form.)

1. My advisor's strengths are . . .
2. I have the following suggestion(s) to improve my advisor's performance:

Appendix B

TOWSON UNIVERSITY PROMOTION, TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT CALENDAR

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

The First Friday in May
Department and College P&T 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 Chairperson.

A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on Department P&T Committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and dean.

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

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

The First Friday in September
Department Chairperson approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department P&T Committee.

The Second Friday in September
University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chairperson 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 Chairperson of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
B. College P&T Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's P&T 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. 35
D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the Department Chairperson.

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

The Second Friday in October

A. Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.
B. College P&T 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 P&T 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 P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T 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 last known address.

The First Friday in December
Department P&T documents are delivered to the College P&T 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 P&T Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the Department Chairperson.
B. The College P&T 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 P&T Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
C. The Department P&T 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 Chairperson 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 P&T Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and dean of the college.

Appendix C

Department of Special Education
Review Committee Agreement

I, _____, by signing this document acknowledged that I have reviewed the pertinent files relevant to each candidate under review during the _____ academic year and I agree to keep all conversations confidential.

_____ _____

Faculty Signature Date

Appendix D

Department of Special Education
Review Committee Vote Sheet

_____ is requesting

☐ Promotion

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

☐ Tenure

☐ Merit

☐ Third Year Review

☐ Five Year Comprehensive Review

……

☐ I Support the Request

☐ I Do Not Support the Request

Towson University ID #_____

Date: _____

Appendix E

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

P & T RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____
(Faculty Member)

This form is to be completed for all faculty holding a fulltime contract by each department upon the conclusion of its promotions and tenure process each fall. It is forwarded to the appropriate college/school Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committee for use during its deliberations. By signing this form faculty candidates indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendation(s); it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendation(s). Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendation(s) should follow procedures found in Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit in the Faculty Handbook.

The _____Department P&T Committee voted to recommend that you have:
- o Tenure granted
- o Tenure denied

The _____Department P&T Committee recommends you for the following:
Promotion to:
- o Assistant Professor
- o Associate Professor
- o Professor
- o No promotion

The _____ Department P&T Committee recommends you for the following:
- o No Merit
- o Base Merit
- o Base +Merit

The _____Department P&T Committee recommends that you be:
- o Reappointed
- o Not reappointed

_____
Faculty Member Signature Date