The JESS and MILDRED FISHER COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS
PROMOTION, TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT COMMITTEE
POLICIES, PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND STANDARDS *approved 5-12-2023*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission Statement

I. **General Directions……..3**

II. **Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit, Three-Year Review and Five-Year Comprehensive Review Recommendations……...3**

III. **College-wide Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure……...4**

IV. **Materials to be submitted for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations……8**

V. **Instructions for the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics (FCSM) Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Portfolio……8**

VI. **Additional Evaluation Materials for Third Year Review of Faculty……..12**

VII. **Instructions for the Provost's Evaluation Portfolio……..12**

VIII. **Instructions for the Comprehensive Five-Year Review……..13**

IX. **College-wide Criteria and Standards for Merit……..13**

X. **Materials to be submitted for Merit and Reappointment……....14**

XI. **Appeals and Negative Recommendations……15**

XII. **Important Dates……16**

XIII. **Copies of forms for Promotion and Tenure……..18**

XIV. **Appendices……20**
A. **The Boyer Model of Scholarship……20**
B. **FCSM Election Procedures……..21**
C. **Departmental Peer Teaching Observation Forms……23**

The FCSM Promotion and Tenure Committee Mission Statement

The FCSM PTRM Committee consists of one representative from each department elected by the FCSM at large. The FCSM Dean is an ex officio non-voting member of the Committee. The primary obligation of the Committee is to review the submitted files to ensure fairness and equity to faculty members who are being evaluated for promotion and tenure. The FCSM PTRM Committee is advisory to the FCSM Dean on other performance evaluations.

In accordance with the Strategic Plan of the University, the FCSM PTRM Committee aims to maintain a highly qualified faculty that balances the tripartite responsibilities of teaching and advising, scholarly activity, and service. In order to implement this objective, the Committee will evaluate the files of the candidates according to Towson University policies for faculty evaluation, which are in accordance with the Boyer Model of Scholarship (see Appendix A). The Committee will then make recommendations to the Provost.

As part of its duties, the Committee will fully investigate appeals from departmental recommendations and, if it deems appropriate, will attempt to resolve such disputes before a final decision and vote is taken.

I. General Directions

A. Composition of the Committee and election of its members

- The FCSM PTRM Committee will consist of one representative from each department elected at large from the college for a period of three years. These three-year terms shall be staggered to ensure some consistency from year to year. Members may serve no more than two consecutive terms. Eligible members include tenured faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor who have been in the FCSM for at least three years. Chairpersons and faculty members who are candidates for promotion are not eligible. The Dean of the College shall serve as an ex officio non-voting member of this Committee. In the event of vacancies on the FCSM PTRM Committee, the FCSM electorate shall choose a replacement before the FCSM PTRM Committee begins its work.

- The role of the ex officio member is to clarify procedural details and ensure due process. This member should refrain from expressing personal opinions on the quality of the evaluation portfolios or on the performance of candidates under review unless requested to do so by members of the FCSM PRTM Committee.

- The election of the members of the FCSM PTRM Committee will be according to the procedures of FCSM as indicated at https://www.towson.edu/fcsm/about/documents/election-procedures.pdf (see Appendix B).

B. Forms Required

- To ensure that accurate Annual Reports (AR) are available at the appropriate times, the promotion and tenure chairperson(s) of each department in the FCSM must make sure that these Reports are completed and filed with the department by the deadline established by the University PTRM Committee.
- The FCSM recommendation forms must be signed by the individual and by the chairperson of the departmental rank and /or tenure committee. If the recommended faculty member is the chairperson of the departmental rank and/or tenure committee, then the chairperson of the department must cosign the document.
- All documents and supporting data are confidential and should be submitted to the office of the Dean of FCSM, where they are kept in a FCSM PTRM file.

C. Schedules

- The FCSM PTRM Committee shall adhere to the deadlines set by the University PTRM Committee (see Section XII Important Dates).
- Additional or supplementary documents sent to the FCSM PTRM Committee after November 30th will not be accepted unless specifically requested by the responsible departmental committee or the FCSM PTRM Committee and approved by the FCSM PTRM Committee.

D. Approval Process on Revisions of the FCSM PTRM Document and/or Procedures

- FCSM PTRM documents pertaining to standards, criteria, and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the PTRM Committee. The FCSM PTRM document must be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the FCSM for input at least ten (10) business days prior to the FCSM PTRM Committee vote on the documents. Final approval at the college level shall be by a simple majority vote of the tenured/tenure-track faculty of the FCSM excepting faculty who are on leave from the university (e.g., medical, sabbatical, etc.), the signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the college will signify that s/he has voted on the FCSM PTRM documents. Balloting will be conducted by the FCSM Elections Committee as described in Appendix B.

- The FCSM document shall be approved by the FCSM Dean. The Dean is responsible for transmitting the document with any proposed changes to the University PTRM Committee by the second Friday in October.

II. Policies and Procedures of the FCSM PTRM Committee for Promotion, Tenure, and Five-Year Comprehensive Review

A. General

- The FCSM PTRM Committee will review faculty files in the context of its Mission Statement and the document "TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK AND TENURE OF FACULTY."
- All matters considered by the Committee pertaining to individual faculty members shall be held in strict confidence.
- Because of the importance of the Committee's deliberations, all voting members must be present at all meetings.
- During deliberation, any voting Committee member may request reconsideration and a revote on tenure, promotion, or reappointment decisions at any time.
- The entire Committee shall review all outgoing correspondence. This correspondence must include written specifics justifying the Committee's decision based on the file of the candidate, including minority viewpoints.
- The FCSM PTRM Committee shall review its PTRM document every three (3) years and submit evidence of such review to the FCSM Dean and the University PTRM Committee.
- All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

B. Tenure and Promotion

- Each Committee member individually will examine the materials submitted by each department for faculty members recommended for tenure and/or promotion, and will decide whether to support or deny the recommendations.
- During meetings of the full Committee, each Committee member will contribute to an open discussion of each candidate. Following the discussion, the Committee will vote to support or deny the departmental recommendation concerning the candidate. A simple majority (at least 3 out of the possible 5) is required. The voting shall follow the guidelines mentioned in IIA above concerning the secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes will be tallied by the committee chair who shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the Provost. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
- The recommendations of the department, of the FCSM PTRM Committee, and of the Dean of FCSM, will be forwarded, together with all pertinent files, to the Provost. All the recommendations of the Dean of FCSM will be shared with the FCSM PTRM Committee.

III. College-wide Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure

A. Statement of Philosophy

The following are the general criteria and standards for promotion and tenure within the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics. We recognize that each department within the FCSM has a distinctive character and set of expectations and the purpose of this document is not to stifle that individuality. Conversely, we also believe that there should be some commonality of standards that

apply to all departments within the FCSM that reflects the nature and mission of the College. This outline attempts to reconcile these different views.

B. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The promotion to Associate Professor carries the awarding of tenure, so we treat these as one and the same.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is the most important step up the academic ladder for two reasons. First, newly promoted faculty members can remain at Towson throughout their academic lifetime; promotion with tenure should be considered as a commitment to keeping that faculty member as a productive colleague throughout this time. Second, if promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is not granted, that faculty member will likely leave Towson University. For these reasons, it is important that the general criteria and expectations for this promotion be laid out clearly.

In general, the FCSM does not feel that rigid, quantitative criteria are appropriate for a faculty whose interests range from astrophysics to zoology. This is especially true in the area of scholarship, where use of numbers of publications, grants, or presentations at meetings is highly variable among disciplines. However, we have provided some general guidelines for achievements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

Teaching — The general expectation of the FCSM is that teaching is our central function and that all faculty should strive to be outstanding teachers. Assessing teaching performance, however, is extremely difficult. Our general philosophy is that no single criterion can be used to adequately judge teaching performance. At a minimum, the following must be used to measure teaching effectiveness. The listed items are not prioritized according to order of importance.

- quantitative student evaluation scores as designated by the department. The method for determination of quantitative scores should be provided by each department to the FCSM PTRM Committee.
- all qualitative comments from student evaluation forms
- course syllabi
- copies of all signed reports from peer observations of teaching (Approved departmental peer observation forms can be found in Appendix C)
- evidence of advising (include a narrative summary and self-reflection that describes the number of advisees, methods of advisement, range of issues discussed, etc.)

However, in addition to the above items, other measures are also appropriate. Other items that may be included, where appropriate, are (but not limited to) the following. The list is not prioritized according to order of importance.

- examples of novel assessments
- evidence of the development of new courses
- evidence of significant modification of course content or delivery
- evidence of improvement of personal knowledge of subject content or teaching methodologies
- evidence of contributions and/or delivery of a new curriculum
- professional awards for teaching excellence
- evidence of supervision of student research
- for mathematics and science educators: evidence of supervision and mentoring of pre-service teachers

Scholarship — The FCSM recognizes that faculty practice four kinds of scholarship as defined by the Boyer Model (see Appendix A): the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The general expectation of the FCSM is that all faculty members should be able to demonstrate the presence of an active and ongoing program of scholarship of one or more of these

forms. The faculty member needs to demonstrate the ability to initiate and carry out to completion scholarly work at Towson University in his/her specialty as evidenced by the following. The listed items are **not** prioritized according to order of importance. When scholarly products involve student co-authors this should be duly noted.

- publications in peer reviewed scholarly journals
- when appropriate to a discipline, publications in peer reviewed conference proceedings
- publication of a professionally appropriate peer reviewed book, textbook, manual or extensive monograph
- submission of university-approved patent applications to the U.S. Patent Office or the awarding of such patents

In addition to a scholarly publication record, several other possible items are illustrated below. Note that these are examples of supporting evidence that may be used, and others may be employed at the discretion of the department. The listed criteria are not prioritized according to order of importance.

- competitive internal and external grants proposals, applied for and/or received
- progress reports or final reports on the implementation of externally funded projects
- presenting papers at professional meetings
- documented research in progress
- conducting workshops (This item might be expected to count more heavily for mathematics and science education faculty)
- invited lectures
- serving as a panelist or discussant at professional meetings
- professional awards based on scholarly achievement

The quality of the scholarly products may be considered in the candidate's evaluation.

Service — The general expectation of the FCSM is that all faculty members should be actively engaged in service, to the department, the College, the University community, and to the faculty member's discipline. The exact level of service is primarily a departmental function and no specific level of service is mandated here. Faculty are expected to make useful, documented contributions to their department, their College, the University, and to their discipline. Some examples of service include:

- Department, FCSM and/or University committees or taskforces
- Professional service (e.g., manuscript or proposal review, serving as an officer in a professional association, chairing (and/or organizing) sessions at professional meetings)

2. <u>Promotion to Professor</u>

Promotion to Professor is the ultimate step in academic recognition. This promotion should recognize not only length of service, but also a **sustained commitment** to excellence or distinction in teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition to high levels of teaching effectiveness (using criteria noted above), and a leadership role in the area of service, faculty should demonstrate a sustained program of recognized scholarship, as indicated by, for example, a substantial refereed publication record, successful textbook authorship, success in attracting external grants, and presentations at national and international meetings. We emphasize that while different disciplines will necessarily have different levels of grant success and publication, the key element is a sustained commitment to peer-reviewed scholarly productivity.

<u>Candidates' activities in their tenure review year (typically the sixth year) shall be considered in promotion to Professor, as these activities were not counted towards tenure.</u>

Letters of evaluation from external reviewers will be solicited from outside the University pursuant to the Guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate (see Appendix E). In general, external evaluators should not be current or former mentors, students or collaborators within the past five

years, nor should they pose other significant potential conflicts of interest. Candidates may also submit names of those persons that they prefer NOT be asked to write an evaluation. The external evaluation will address the candidate's scholarship as it relates to the candidate's promotion to Professor. The letters will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. The content of these external letters may be quoted in the committee, department chair, and Dean letters, as long as the confidentiality of the evaluators is maintained. These letters will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review, along with an optional departmental review of the external letters.

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

a) A curriculum vitæ
b) The applicant's supporting statement focusing on the area of scholarship and reflecting on accomplishments during the evaluation period. This statement should be written for experts in the field, rather than for a general audience.
c) A maximum of three (3) publications or other scholarly products, either as readable files or internet links thereto. The external evaluators will be able to request additional items on the candidate's curriculum vitæ by contacting the Department Chairperson.

C. Clinical Faculty

Clinical Faculty must demonstrate a record of effective teaching using evidence from the items listed in section B.1 above. Clinical faculty are also expected to maintain all licenses and certifications relevant for their professional practice.

1. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor are similar to those listed above for Tenure-track faculty, but with greater emphasis on the teaching record. In addition to the forms of supporting evidence of scholarly activity listed in B.1. above, the following may also be considered:

- professional practice guidelines, textbooks, and other educational materials,
- consultation to government agencies, industry, or professional groups
- completion of industry and academic training

2. Promotion to Clinical Professor

Promotion to Clinical Professor is the ultimate step in academic recognition. This promotion should recognize not only length of service, but also a **sustained commitment** to excellence or distinction in teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition to high levels of teaching effectiveness (using criteria noted above), and a leadership role in the area of service, faculty should demonstrate a consistent program of scholarship of application, discovery, integration and/or teaching, as indicated by, for example, a record of refereed publications, successful textbook authorship, success in attracting external grants, innovations in program or curriculum development, or presentations at national and international meetings.

External letters of support may be submitted for the evaluation, but they are not required.

IV. **Materials to be submitted by each Department for Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations**

A. Summary Sheet

Departmental Promotion and /or Tenure Recommendation Summary Form containing a list of all Faculty members being recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the recommended promotion rank, and the recommended tenure decision (if applicable).

1. A list of names of all faculty members recommended for promotion for each academic rank.
2. A list of names of all faculty members recommended for tenure.
3. A list of names of all faculty members recommended for reappointment.

B. One Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Portfolio (see V below) for each candidate

C. One Provost's Evaluation Portfolio (see VII below) for each candidate

Note that the Merit evaluation portfolio (see Section X below) is independent of and separate from the Promotion and Tenure evaluation portfolio.

V. **Instructions for the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics (FCSM) Promotion & Tenure Evaluation Portfolio**

Each FCSM faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure is expected to prepare a evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial expectations of faculty in the University, the FCSM and the candidate's department. The materials in Sections A through D of this document should be organized in electronic folders in the indicated sequence, separated and indexed with file names indicative of the tabs listed below. This document addresses the organization of the evaluation portfolio only and in no way is to be interpreted as setting or clarifying existing or future promotion and tenure policies for the FCSM. All of the below material will appear within the folder labeled "Supplementary Materials" on the PTRM SharePoint site that will be shared by the Provost's Office.

Section A: Summary and Recommendations

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

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

Tab A.1. Curriculum Vitæ

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

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

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

Tab A.5. Fisher College of Science and Mathematics Promotion and Tenure Form (FCSM P&T Form).

Tab A.6. SENTF or Annual Reports (AR Parts I and II) for the Entire Evaluation Period. The candidate should submit annual reports for the entire evaluation period. These forms should be arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section B: Teaching

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

Categories for Teaching

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

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

SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, 20XX to 20XX

Semester/year	Title and Course Number	Number of Students
1. Fall, 2006	Biology: The Science of Life / Biol115	24

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

Tab B.2. Peer Reports of Class Visits: Include a minimum of two peer observations per year (two different class meetings) for tenure-track or clinical assistant faculty and two for promotion to Full Professor or Clinical Professor with at least one within the last two years for candidates for promotion to Professor. All teaching evaluations that were conducted during the review period should be included in the evaluation portfolio. Approved departmental peer observation forms can be found in Appendix C.

The following are additional ***potential categories*** for teaching and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly.

Tab B.3. On-load Student Advising: Include a narrative summary and self-reflection that describes the number of advisees, methods of advisement, range of issues discussed, etc.

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

Tab B.5. Independent Studies, Practica, Honors Theses, Theses, and Dissertations: These items should be listed as follows:

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

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

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

Section C: Scholarship

The FCSM recognizes that faculty members may undertake four types of scholarship as defined by the well-known Boyer Model: the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The general expectation of the FCSM is that all faculty members should be able to demonstrate the presence of an active and ongoing program of scholarship in one or more of these forms. Faculty members need to demonstrate the ability to initiate and carry to completion scholarly work at Towson University in their specialties. Scholarly work is considered validated when it is submitted for peer review and deemed worthy of publication or other form of dissemination. Submission for peer review of competitive proposals for extramural funding is also a valid form of scholarship.

This section should begin with a table of contents listing all documents that support the areas of scholarship listed below.

Categories for Scholarship

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOCUMENTATION

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

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

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

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

Tab C.5. Significant Professional Services: List memberships on editorial boards, activities as referee for scholarly journals, activities as referee for granting agencies, memberships on evaluation panels, preK-12 curriculum development, and services as critic, juror, and/or consultant for professional organizations. Include only those activities that are a reflection or outcome of the candidate's scholarly expertise (other professional service activities may be included within Section D). Documentation verifying the activity should be provided.

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

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

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

Section D: Service

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

Categories for Service

The following are the potential categories for service and all significant contributions should be organized accordingly. Contributions associated with a stipend and/or course release should be listed under Tab D.8.

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

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

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

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

Tab D.5. Significant Community Participation: List lectures, speeches, presentations, and short courses presented in the community and include dates.

Tab D.6. Meritorious Public Service: List assistance to governmental agencies and development of community, state, or national resources and include dates.

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

Tab D.8. Service or Leadership Roles Associated with Stipends and/or Course Releases: List any categories of service for which a course release and/or stipend was received.

VI. Additional Evaluation Materials for Third Year Review of Faculty

The review period for the third year review is the first two years and the fall semester of the third year. Evaluation portfolio materials for third year review of faculty must include the above items in Section V, with these modifications:

- Syllabi of all courses taught during the review period should be included
- Student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising during the review period should be included (Approved departmental peer observation forms can be found in Appendix C)
- The Summary of Major Accomplishments (Tab A.2) should describe how the candidate has met and integrated teaching, scholarship and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

Note: Third year reviews do not include the preparation of a Provost's Evaluation Portfolio.

VII. Instructions for the Provost's Evaluation Portfolio

A summative evaluation portfolio should also be prepared to be forwarded to the Provost. The documents required will be limited to the following in the exact order. These files/folders will be

Section I

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

Section II

- *Curriculum Vitae*

Section III

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

Section IV

- 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 advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.

- For tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review, peer teaching evaluations shall be included (Approved departmental peer observation forms can be found in Appendix C).

Section V

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

Section VI

- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form

- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson

- Written recommendation of the FCSM PTRM Committee

- Written recommendation of the academic dean

[NOTE: For Section V, the FCSM PTRM Chairperson and the dean have responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations are included in the folder.]

The department should retain any other supportive materials and make them available if needed. These materials are not to be forwarded unless specifically requested. ***Evaluation Portfolios that do not comply with this organization will be returned to the college.***

VIII. Instructions for the Comprehensive Five-Year Review

Sections I-V of the Comprehensive Five-Year Review evaluation portfolio will be identical to those of Provost's P&T evaluation portfolio, as described above in VII. Instructions for the Provost's Evaluation Portfolio, and will cover the five years under review and should also include a statement outlining goals and expected career development plans for the upcoming 5 year period. Section VI should only include the following:

- Final evaluation of the departmental Comprehensive Review Committee,
- Letter of evaluation from department chairperson,
- Letter of evaluation from academic dean

IX. College-wide Criteria and Standards for Merit

- The department chair will decide on merit based on the correspondence between the Annual Report Parts I and II for the academic year under review, and the level of effort and performance in completing one's agreed-to duties. Each department chairperson will determine the merit ranking of all full-time faculty members according to the process outlined in their respective PTRM documents and the FCSM Dean will evaluate the department Chairpersons

- The Annual Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and Chairpersons shall be used as the instrument to evaluate for merit decision.

- For all full-time faculty which includes tenure/tenure track, lecturers, clinical faculty and professors of practice – department chair sends the dean, and copies the faculty member, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons

- For chairpersons – the FCSM dean sends the Provost, and copies the chairperson, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons to the chairperson

- Any negative decision must be accompanied by a written rationale in the comments section of the evaluation form or as an attachment and delivered electronically via a file delivery system (FDS) or certified mail.

- Faculty/chairpersons may appeal a decision of no merit.

Each faculty member and/or Chairperson will be rated in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship,service, and/or leadership (only for department chairpersons) using the following terms:

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

MEETS DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS: Meets expectations satisfactorily as established by the respective department PTRM documents

Subsequently, recommendations for merit will be based on the following guidelines:

No merit: If a faculty or chairperson receives "below departmental standards" in any one of the categories of teaching and advising; Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (as applicable); Service to Department College or Community (as applicable) ; and Leadership in the case of Chairpersons will result automatically in a merit ranking of "no merit."

Merit: The faculty or chairperson has met departmental standards in all of the evaluation categories.

Faculty/chairpersons on sabbatical, FMLA, or other leave during the year under review will only be rated on categories relevant to their duties as agreed upon in their Annual Workload Plan (AR 2 form) for the year under review.

X. Materials to be submitted for Merit and Reappointment

Materials to be included in full-time faculty/chairperson merit evaluation portfolio:

a) Annual Workload Plan or Chairs Annual Workload Plan
b) Annual Report or Chairs Annual Report (for the year under review)
c) Updated CV
d) Syllabi of courses taught during the year
e) All available student evaluations for the period under review
f) Any peer observations received during the review period
g) Any other department specific documentation that is described in the department PTRM document

<u>Justification for Denial</u>

A chairperson or Dean that makes a negative recommendation must be accompanied by a written rationale in the comments section of the evaluation form or as an attachment and be delivered electronically via the FDS or via certified mail.

XI. Appeals and Negative Recommendations

A. Negative Recommendations

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail or via FDS to the faculty member's last known address/email address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level except for merit appeals. The merit appeals process has its own timeline and process as listed below. 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 or FDS, 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.

B. Appeals

1. 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 or timestamp of the email received through FDS.

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

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

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

ii. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

i. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM Committee.

ii. 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 or via FDS to the respective Dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation. If delivered to the Dean, the appeal shall be forwarded to the UPTRM within two (2) business days of delivery.

iii. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the Dean and the University PTRM Committee chair. Appeals of FCSM

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

iv. 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. The chair of the department PTRM committee will make the letter available to the full committee.

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

c. 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.

C. No Merit Appeals

Faculty may appeal a decision of "no merit" by submitting a written response of the Department Chairperson's decision along with the Department Chairperson's rationale to the Department PTRM Committee, with a copy to the Department Chairperson, by the second Friday in September. The Department Chairperson may provide the department PTRM Committee with written comments regarding the negative decision but should not participate in the Committee deliberations. The faculty under consideration will not participate in the Committee deliberations. A decision of "no merit" shall be reviewed by the Department PTRM committee only if the faculty member submits a rebuttal.

The Department PTRM Committee will submit a written decision to the Dean, with a copy to the faculty member and the chairperson, by the fourth Friday in September. The Dean will review the materials submitted by the PTRM Committee, the Department Chairperson and the faculty and will submit a decision to the Provost Budget Office (positive recommendations) or to the Provost. In the event of a negative decision by the dean, the Provost will review the materials submitted by the chairperson, the faculty, the PTRM committee and the dean. The Provost decision shall be final.

Chairpersons may appeal a decision of "no merit" by submitting a written rebuttal of the Dean's decision to the Provost, with a copy to the dean, by the second Friday in September. The Provost will review the materials submitted by the Dean and the Chairperson. The Provost decision shall be final.

Positive outcomes of the appeal process will be relayed to the PBO and retroactive pay the faculty member by the fourth Friday in October. The Dean relays this to the PBO in the case of a faculty member and the Provost in the case of the chairperson.

XII. Important Dates

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

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

First Monday in April in the academic year prior to an evaluation
Candidates for promotion to Professor will submit a list of five potential external reviewers to the Chair of their department.

The Third Friday in May
Formation of College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committees and election of chair for upcoming cycle.

Third Monday in May in the academic year prior to an evaluation

Chair will identify five additional external evaluators and forward the list of 10 (including the five named by the Candidate) to the Dean's office. Query Letter to potential external evaluators will be sent from the Dean's office to identify three external evaluators.

May 31st

Fulltime faculty and Chairpersons submit their Annual Workload Plan (Annual Report – part II form) and Annual Report (Annual Report - part I form) for the year under review to the Department Chairperson or FCSM Dean.

In the event that May 31st falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline shall be the first business day after May 31st.

The Third Friday in June

A. All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

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

C. Candidates for Professor submit their electronic files (PDF or similar) for external evaluators to the Dean's office.

First Monday in July

Three external reviewers will be confirmed and sent supporting documentation to complete their evaluation.

First Business Day in July

Chair submits merit evaluation form of the faculty member to dean, and faculty member. FCSM dean sends the Provost, and the chairperson, the completed merit evaluation form of the chairperson. Any negative decision is also conveyed.

August 1 (USM mandated)

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year.

The Second Friday in September

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

B. Faculty or chairperson appeal the chairperson's/FCSM Deans merit decision if applicable

The Third Friday in September

A. FCSM PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM Committee (if necessary).

B. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.

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

D. External review letters for promotion to Professor will be forwarded from the Dean's office to the candidate's department PTRM committee for departmental review.

The Fourth Friday in September

The departmental PTRM Committee will render a written decision to the dean, copying the faculty member and the chairperson on “no merit” appeal from

The Second Friday in October

A. Department PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.

B. FCSM PTRM documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.

C. The FCSM dean will notify the faculty member, the department PTRM committee chair, and the department chairperson of their decision on the no merit appeal from faculty.

The Fourth Friday in October

A. Department chairperson’s written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

C. The department PTRM committee’s report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

D. All merit appeal decisions for faculty and chairpersons are completed by Provost

The Second Friday in November

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

November 30th

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

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

The First Friday in December

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the FCSM PTRM Committee if any changes have been made.

December 15th (USM mandated date)

Tenure-track faculty in their second and subsequent academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

The First Friday in January

The FCSM PTRM Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the Dean.

The Third Friday in January

A. The Dean’s written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

B. The FCSM PTRM Committee’s report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean’s recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

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

D. First year faculty submits SENTF, syllabi, and student/peer evaluations to Department chair

The First Friday in February

A. The FCSM Dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the Committee's and the Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

B. The department chair's review is due to the first-year faculty member and the Dean either via FDS or certified mail. If there is a negative review and non-reappointment recommendation by chair, then the department PTRM committee is convened.

The Second Friday in February

A. 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.

The Third Friday in February

The department PTRM committee reviews the negative recommendation of the chair for first year faculty and delivers its recommendation to the first year faculty, chair, and Dean

The Fourth Friday in February

The FCSM Dean's review and recommendation of the first year faculty is delivered to the first year faculty, chair, department PTRM committee, and Provost

M**arch 1**

The Provost notifies the President about first year faculty reappointment or non-reappointment prior to 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 on promotion and/or tenure is conveyed to the faculty member, department and FCSM PTRM Committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and Dean of the FCSM.

The First Friday in May

Department and FCSM PTRM Committees are formed (elections for membership on the FCSM PTRM Committee are already completed).

XIII. Copies of forms for Promotion and Tenure

A. Reappointment Forms
- Department Reappointment Review Ballot (pdf)
- Department Reappointment Review Summary (pdf)

B. Tenure and/or Promotion Forms
- Department Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation Ballot (pdf)
- Department Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation Summary (pdf)
- FCSM Department Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation Form (docx)
- College Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation Ballot (pdf)
- College Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendation Summary (pdf)

C. Merit Forms
- FCSM Departmental Merit Recommendation Form (FCSM Merit Form) (docx)
- Current Department Merit/Reappointment Recommendation Form (CDMR) (pdf)

D. Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) Form (pdf)

E. Third Year Review Forms
- Department Third Year Review Ballot (pdf)
- Department Third Year Review Summary (pdf)

F. Five Year Review Forms
- Department Five Year Comprehensive Review Ballot (pdf)
- Department Five Year Comprehensive Review Summary (pdf)

G. Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR) form (docx)

H. FCSM Faculty Annual Report (AR) form (docx)

I. Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form (docx)

XIV. Appendices

Appendix A. **The Boyer Model of Scholarship**

In “Enlarging the Perspective,” the second chapter of Boyer’s 1990 report Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, the author outlines four “separate but overlapping functions” of scholarship which constitute the primary work of the professoriate: discovery, integration, application and teaching. These constitute “the Boyer Model” of scholarship....

Boyer takes issue with the assumptions we make about what constitutes scholarship. People assume a linear cause-and-effect relationship between scholarship that moves from research, to publication, to application to teaching. It's as though the latter are not considered part of scholarship at all, but “grow out of it” (15). Boyer contests: “The arrow of causality can, and frequently does, point in both directions. Theory surely leads to practice. But practice also leads to theory. Teaching, at its best, shapes both research and practice”. Thus begins Boyer's mission to parse out the four levels of scholarship into the following model. All four elements “dynamically interact, forming an interdependent whole.”

DISCOVERY: This element of scholarship is purely investigative, in search of new information. At the core of scholarship, it is “what contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university” and Boyer considers investigation and research “at the very heart of academic life”. These scholars ask, “What is to be known? What is yet to be found?”

INTEGRATION: This element of scholarship is what happens when scholars put isolated facts into perspective, “making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way” -- work that “seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research”. Closely related to discovery, integration draws connections and examines contexts often in an interdisciplinary and interpretive way. Boyer sees integration as a growing trend in universities, where disciplines are converging and the boundaries between fields is becoming blurry. These scholars ask “What do the findings mean? Is it possible to interpret what's been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?”

APPLICATION: This element of scholarship is the most practical in that it seeks out ways in which knowledge can solve problems and serve both the community and the campus. As opposed to merely “citizenship,” Boyer argues that “to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity”. He importantly notes that knowledge is not necessarily first “discovered” and then later “applied” – “new intellectual understandings,” Boyer writes, “can arise out of the very act of application...theory and practice vitally interact and one renews the other.” These scholars ask “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to problems? How can it be helpful to people and institutions?”

TEACHING: This element of scholarship recognizes the work that goes into mastery of knowledge as well as the presentation of information so that others might understand it. “Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well” – and by interacting with students, professors themselves are pushed in creative new directions. These scholars ask “How can knowledge best be transmitted to others and best learned?”

Boyer, Ernest L., 1990. Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate, A special report. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton University Press, 151 p.

Appendix B. **FCSM Election Procedures**

I. PURPOSE

This document applies to the election of

A. members of the College P&T Committee,
B. at-large delegates to the College Council,
C. College representative(s) to the
    1. University P&T Committee
    2. University Senate;

and to

D. any special balloting that may be required from time to time (e.g., changing the College constitution or name).

This will be reviewed by the FCSM Council at least every two years.

II. THE ELECTORATE

For the elections of offices dealing directly with promotions and tenure, the electorate shall be all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. For all other elections, the electorate shall be all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members and other full-time faculty.

III. THE FCSM ELECTION COMMITTEE (FCSMEC)

A. The FCSM Election Committee will consist of three members. All committee members must be tenured or on tenure track, to be appointed by the Chair of the College Council. The three members must be from three different departments.
B. Members shall serve 3-year staggered terms.
C. The Chairperson of FCSMEC will be the member with the longest tenure on the committee unless the members unanimously agree otherwise.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. The FCSMEC shall be responsible for seeing that the rules of eligibility for election to the University and College P&T Committees, as defined respectively in the Faculty Handbook and in the FCSM Constitution and Bylaws are met. However, the FCSMEC is not the final interpreter and arbiter; those duties belong to the University P&T Committee and the College Council.
B. The FCSMEC, in cooperation with the Office of the Dean of FCSM, shall keep a current record of the full-time faculty in the College, with rank and tenure status including (de facto tenure) at the time elected service would begin.
C. The FCSMEC is responsible for conducting elections according to the following procedures.

V. ELECTION PROCEDURES

The following must be followed for each valid regular and run-off election as well as for nominations. If creditable evidence is presented that the procedures were not followed, the College Council will investigate. The normal election process shall consist of two phases:

- the nomination phase;
- the election phase.

A. NOMINATION PHASE

1. A nomination "packet" (usually distributed electronically) shall include:
    a. an announcement of the vacant position(s);
    b. the reason(s) for the vacancy;
    c. a list of any incumbent(s);
    d. a list of any continuing members(s);

e. the requirements for eligibility for each open position
(If there is an election for any member(s) of the FCSM P&T Committee, a statement should be included that anyone expecting to be recommended for a promotion during the three-year term of office should not allow him/herself to be nominated for FCSM P&T); and
f. the current roster of those in various departments from which any candidate is sought.

2. Nomination ballots usually will be submitted electronically.

3. The ballots shall allow a member of the electorate to nominate up to two people for each open position.

4. For each open position, all receiving the two highest number of nominations will stand for election. Thus, after nomination ballots have been counted, the FCSMEC must contact each nominee to verify any nominee's willingness to serve. Should some nominee(s) be unable to stand for election, the committee will proceed through the list of nominees in (descending) order until those willing and having the two highest number of nominations are determined.

B. ELECTION PHASE

1. Election ballots usually will be submitted electronically.

2. The ballots shall allow a member of the electorate to cast only one vote for each open position.

3. The entire FCSM Elections Committee will review the results of the election.

4. The Chairperson of the FCSM Elections Committee will disseminate the results of the election (usually via an email) to the FCSM electorate.

Appendix C. **Departmental Peer Teaching Observation Forms**

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT:

To: Department of Biological Sciences Merit/Tenure Committee
From: Evaluation Subcommittee for evaluation of:
Submitted by:
Date:

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

Content:

Methodology:

Interaction with students:

Additional Materials Evaluated (Syllabus, tests, etc.):

Summary of general performance:

The above statement is an accurate summary of our evaluation:

Signature of each subcommittee member:

CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT:

CLASS VISITATION REPORT

Course Title: _____ Course No.: _____

Semester/Year: _____ Meeting Times: _____

Name of instructor: _____

A. Accuracy of content

Technical Terminology (appropriate use of)

Nomenclature (correct/current use of)

Use of symbols and structures (accuracy, clarity, conforms to conventions)

Other

B. Level of content

Quantitation (course appropriate handling of)

Other

C. Clarity of delivery

Use of media (competence with chosen format)

Legibility/Visibility

Voice (projection/pacing)

Other

D. Overall Effectiveness

Class interaction

Other

E. Miscellaneous

Date of Visit: _____ Time of Visit: _____

Name of Visitor: _____ Signature: _____

I have read this visitation report.

_____

Instructor's Signature Date

COMPUTER & INFORMATION SCIENCES DEPARTMENT:

CLASSROOM VISITATION RECORD

Class visited:_____

Instructor:_____

Date of visit:_____

Signature of visitor:_____

Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5.

5 – VERY GOOD

4 – GOOD

3 – FAIR

2 – POOR

1 – VERY POOR

Please write n/a on any statement that does not apply.

1. Organization of lesson. Score:_____

Comments_____

2. Knowledge of course material. Score:_____

Comments_____

3. Clarity of presentation. Score:_____

Comments_____

4. Motivation of students. Score:_____

Comments_____

5. Student participation. Score:_____

Comments_____

6. Student rapport. Score:_____

Comments_____

7. Degree of helpfulness to students. Score:_____

Comments_____

Additional comments:

_____

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT:

TOWSON UNIVERSITY

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT
Classroom Visitation

Class visited:_____

Instructor: _____

Date of visitation: _____

Signature of visitor: _____

	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	NA
1. Organization of the lesson.						
2. Knowledge of the subject.						
3. Clarity of presentation.						
4. Motivation of the student.						
5. Student participation.						
6. Student rapport.						
7. Degree of helpfulness to the students.						

Comments:

_____ _____

Instructor's **Signature** **Date**

PHYSICS, ASTRONOMY & GEOSCIENCES DEPARTMENT:

CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT

Evaluation of teaching by faculty colleagues is intended to promote improvement of teaching as well as to gather evidence of teaching effectiveness. The following guidelines should be considered when planning and participating in this process.

1. The date of the visit shall be arranged at least one week in advance of the class period.

2. All visits will be conducted by members of the PDTC. Two faculty members if possible will visit a class period together.

3. The visited and visiting faculty members will meet at least one day prior to the class period so that the visited member may discuss philosophy and objectives for the course and provide a syllabus, etc., to any visitor.

4. Within one week after the visit, an open and professional post-visit conference will be held to discuss the observations made by the visiting faculty members. At this time each visitors proposed Report (see below) will be discussed.

5. Within two weeks after the visit, each visiting faculty member will have completed and placed the Classroom Visitation Report, signed by both visitor and visited, into the visited P&T folder. The visited faculty member (and mentor, if any) will also receive a copy of this report.

VISITED FACULTY MEMBER _____

VISITING FACULTY MEMBER _____

DATE VISITED FACULTY MEMBER WAS INFORMED OF VISIT _____

DATE OF CLASSROOM VISITATION _____

COURSE _____

TOPIC BEING TAUGHT _____

DATE AND BRIEF SUMMARY OF PRE-VISIT MEETING:

SPECIAL TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED (demonstrations, videos, etc):

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: (Note especially efforts to engage students through questions, small group discussions, brief presentations, etc.)

STUDENT RESPONSE:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

DATE OF POST-VISITATION CONFERENCE: _____

SUMMARY (BY VISITOR) OF POST-VISITATION CONFERENCE:

COMMENTS BY VISITED FACULTY MEMBER:

SIGNATURE OF VISITING FACULTY: _____

SIGNATURE OF VISITED FACULTY _____

D. EXTERNAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

The FCSM PTRM Committee guidelines for letters of evaluation from external reviewers for candidates for promotion to Professor will follow the guidelines established by the Provost and approved by the University Senate. The external evaluation will address the candidate's scholarship as it relates to the candidate's promotion to Professor.

I. CONFIDENTIALITY

The letters will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These letters will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

II. IDENTIFYING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Evaluators will be independent and impartial, cannot be members of the Towson University faculty, and should not be current or former advisors or mentors to the candidate or otherwise have (or have had) a personal or significant professional relationship with the candidate within the past five years, nor should they pose other significant potential conflicts of interest. Evaluators must be established scholars or practitioners with demonstrated expertise in the area of the candidate's specialization, and preferably be from or have experience at peer-type institutions.

III. SELECTION OF EVALUATORS

The candidate will recommend 5 evaluators who meet the criteria described above to the department chair. The candidate may also provide names of potential evaluators that they do not want to be used for their evaluation. The department chair will recommend 5 additional evaluators. The Dean will contact the potential evaluators to identify 3 who agree to provide evaluations (see Query letter below). The Dean will request evaluation letters using the letter template below.

IV. SUBJECT MATTER OF EXTERNAL REVIEW

External evaluators are not to evaluate the candidate's teaching, advising or service to the University. The external evaluation will address the candidate's scholarly work as it relates to the candidate's promotion. The candidate shall provide an electronic file (PDF or similar) of the following material to the Dean to be forwarded to the external evaluators electronically:

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

V. TIMELINE

First Monday in April

Candidates for promotion to Professor will submit a list of five potential external reviewers to the chair of their department.

Third Monday in May

Chair will identify five additional external evaluators and forward the list of 10 (including the five named by the Candidate) to the Dean's office. Query Letter to potential external evaluators will be sent from the Dean's office to identify three external evaluators.

Third Friday in June

The candidate's electronic file (PDF or similar) for the external evaluators is submitted to the Dean's office.

First Monday in July

Three external reviewers will be confirmed and sent supporting documentation to complete their evaluation.

Third Friday in September

Letters will be forwarded under separate cover to the candidate's department PTRM committee for departmental review.

Approved by the FCSM PTRM Committee March 30 2023
Approved by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the FCSM, April 20th 2023
Approved by the Dean of the Fisher College of Science and Mathematics, xxxxx