

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND MERIT
DOCUMENT**

Approved by department:

November xx, 2023

Approved by College of Liberal Arts PTRM Committee:

12/21/2023

Approved by Dean of the College of Liberal Arts:

1/11/2024

Approved by UPTRM:

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT (PTR) COMMITTEE

I.	MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT PTR COMMITTEE.....	1
II.	POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE PTR COMMITTEE	
	A. Chair, History Chair, Secretary, PTR Duties, Promotion Subcommittee	
	B. Quorum	
	C. Voting Procedures	
	D. Confidentiality.....	2
	E. Notification of Candidates,	
	F. Publication of Decisions	
	G. Appeals Procedures.....	3
	H. Review of the History PTRM Document	
	I. Changes in Policies	
	J. Annual Report.....	4
	K. Promotion and Tenure.....	5
	L. Third Year Review Procedures.....	5
	M. Five Year Comprehensive Review.....	5
	N. Reappointment.....	5
	O. Merit.....	6
	P. Letter Signing Procedures.....	7
III.	EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE....	8
IV.	MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION	
	A. Overview.....	8
	B. Portfolio Organization.....	9
	C. Summative Portfolio.....	10
	D. Student Evaluations	
	E. Peer Teaching Evaluations.....	11
	F. Lecturers.....	12
	G. File Integrity	
	H. SENTF.....	12
	I. Chairperson's Annual Report.....	12
V.	STANDARDS AND CRITERIA	
	A. Overview.....	12
	B. Faculty Responsibilities	
	C. Evaluation of Teaching and Advising.....	14
	D. Scholarship.....	17
	E. Service.....	19
	F. Chairpersons.....	20
	G. Reappointment.....	20
	H. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.....	21
	I. Third Year Review.....	22
	J. Promotion to Full Professor.....	22
	K. Five Year Comprehensive Review.....	23
	L. Exceptions	

M. Merit.....	23
VI. CALENDAR.....	24
Appendix A: College of Liberal Arts Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar	25

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT (PTR) COMMITTEE

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

I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT PTR COMMITTEE

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

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

A. The Chair of the History PTR Committee will be elected by the History Department PTR Committee for a three-year term during the spring semester. The Chair's duties include calling and managing meetings, ensuring that personnel decisions are made according to the process outlined in this document, overseeing the efforts of subcommittees, writing letters of recommendation, assisting faculty in the creation of their tenure or promotion files, and other duties as necessary. Whenever the History PTR Committee Chair excuses themselves from deliberations on their own materials or is unable to attend a meeting, the senior member of the remaining Committee shall serve as chair. If the History PTR Chair is unable to serve because of a sabbatical leave, faculty exchange, promotion consideration, or for any other reason, the History Department PTR Committee electorate will choose an acting chair for the period of replacement. Whenever the PTR Chair is temporarily absent, the most senior member of the remaining committee serves in their place.

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

The History Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the PTR Committee and shall participate in all deliberations regardless of their academic rank, except for deliberations on their own dossier. As detailed in the ART and the CLA PTRM documents, the History Chair prepares an independent recommendation in each case and includes these recommendations and those of the Committee in candidate files before transmitting them to the CLA PTR Committee. The History Chair shall maintain a copy of all official documents

concerning evaluation recommendations. The History Chair is required to make merit decisions and write letters regarding annual merit determinations.

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

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

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

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

B. Quorum

A quorum will consist of a majority of the voting members of the History PTR Committee, excluding faculty members on leave or on sabbatical, and the History Chair. If fewer than three tenured faculty members (excluding the History Chair) are available to serve on the History PTR Committee, the PTR process will be modified in accordance with the ART IV.C .

below.87

C. Voting Procedures

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

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

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

D. Confidentiality

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

E. Notification of Candidates of Decisions

The History PTR Committee recommendation and a record of the vote count shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the History PTR Chair and submitted to the History Chair as defined by the schedule in Appendix A below. Faculty members will receive the recommendation and a record of the vote count according to the schedule in Appendix A below. Negative recommendations shall be delivered digitally in a secure manner. .

Reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion, tenure, and merit recommendations shall be addressed to the Chair. Third-year review recommendations shall be addressed to the faculty member. Five-year review letters must explicitly address the person's status toward attaining the requirements for promotion. The candidate is encouraged to seek

mentorship from colleagues on the Five-Year Review Committee regarding the path to promotion.

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

F. Publication of Decisions

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

G. Appeal Procedures

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

H. Review of the History PTRM Document

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

I. Changes in Policies

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

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

J. Annual Report

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

K. Promotion and Tenure

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

L. Third Year Review Procedures

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

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

M. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Procedures

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

N. Reappointment

Reappointment of First-Year, SecondYear, and Third-Fifth Year Faculty will follow the guidelines in the ART and the CLA PTR documents utilizing the materials detailed in section IV and the standards set forth in section V below.

226 The History PTR Committee will also review folders from lecturers and visiting
227 assistant professors who serve more than one year. The instructions for those
228 folders are in section IV and standards for evaluation are in section V. These
229 deliberations will take place during the reappointment meeting for tenure track
230 faculty each fall. The History PTR Chair will write a recommendation along
231 the lines of those for tenure track faculty which will focus heavily on
232 teaching. The timing and distribution of those recommendations will be the same
233 as for tenure track faculty.

O, Merit

234 If the History Department chair fails to make a merit recommendation, the History
Department PTR Committee will offer a recommendation

235 according to confidential ballots. The Chair of the PTRMCommittee will
236 tabulate the votes. The four individuals whoreceive the most votes will be
237 named as voting members, theindividual who receives the fifth highest
number of votes will bethe alternate. In case of tie votes the Chair of the
PTRM

a.

- 320
321 . the remaining committee serves in
322 P. Letter Signing Procedures
323

324 The History Department PTR Chair is responsible for assigning PTR
325 members to write all Tenure, Promotion, , Reappointment, and Five-Year
326 Review letters. These letters will be signed by the History PTR Chair (on behalf
327 of the committee) and by the faculty member to whom the letter applies. If a
328 faculty member discovers a grammatical or factual error both the History
329 Department PTR Chair and the History Department Chair should be
330 immediately notified and it will be their responsibility to correct the mistake if
331 warranted.
332

333 III. EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE
334

335 The History PTR Committee will follow the procedures described in Section III
336 of the CLA PTR document.
337

338 IV. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
339

340 A. Overview

341 The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment,
342 third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with
343 the faculty member.
344

345 Guided by the History Chair, the History PTR Chair, and department and
346 college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making
347 distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service
348 and shall include such distinctions in his or her narrative statements and other
349 documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
350

351 All material and documentation used in making recommendations for the annual
352 review process (which includes the Annual Review, reappointment, third-year
353 review, merit consideration, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) shall
354 be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial
355 role and expectations of faculty in the university, as well as the faculty member's
356 college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material
357 and process. The portfolio requirements are detailed below.
358
359

B. Portfolio Organization

Evaluation portfolios shall be

submitted as an electronic portfolio, which should be organized using folders to identify the sections. Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed

pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. As detailed in the ART, Appendix B, section IB, contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - a. completed and signed AR and AWP or CAR and CAWP forms.
 - b. current *curriculum vitae*. The *curriculum vitae* should summarize the candidate's education, teaching, and professional employment; specific courses taught at Towson; honors and grants; scholarly publications; professional presentations, associations, and activities; and record of service to the university, the profession, and the community.
 - c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review.
 - d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - (i) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
 - (ii) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect.
 - (iii) documentation of advising advising log.

- (iv) Teaching narratives should be concise, should highlight new procedures and courses, and should address peer and student evaluations.
- e. documentation of scholarship. This documentation should include a copy of any publication, review, presentation, grant application, or other item identified by the faculty member as part of the faculty member's scholarly activity.
- f. documentation of service. This documentation should include any materials relevant to service, including but not limited to reports authored by committees, posters advertising public talks, or emails detailing community outreach efforts.
- 2.
3. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review and reappointment of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:
- a. all of the above items listed in D.1.
- b. peer and/or chairperson's evaluations of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.
4. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
- a. all materials listed above in D.1. and D.2. from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.
- b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, scholarship, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
- 5.
- The contents of Third-Year Review and Five-Year Comprehensive Reviews folders are detailed in the ART.
6. If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to their 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.
- If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio other than their evaluation, that specific information shall be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the PTR Document Review Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

.

456
457 C. Summative Portfolio

458 In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion or
459 tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost that shall
460 accompany the full evaluation portfolio from the beginning of the process. It shall
461 be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of
462 review. Documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the
463 time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative
464 portfolio shall be compiled as follows:

465 **Section I**

- 466 • *Curriculum vitae*.
- 467 • A copy of *one* recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a
468 comparable creative activity.

469 **Section II**

- 470 • University Forms: Completed and signed AR and AWP or
471 Chairperson's Annual Report CAR and CAWP Forms arranged from most
472 recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

473 **Section III**

- 474 • Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty
475 using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results
476 for each course received from the assessment office. The History
477 Department may vote to develop a supplemental student evaluation
478 system. Results from that system would also be included in this section.
479 Any departmental forms will compile the data in a format that will allow
480 analysis of trends over time

- 481 • A narrative statement about individual teaching and advising
482 philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson
483 evaluations.

- 484 • Peer teaching evaluations.

485 **Section IV**

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

489 **Section V**

- 490 • Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party at the
491 appropriate stage).
- 492 • Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or
493 tenure committee, including the departmental Summary Recommendation
494 form.
- 495 • Written recommendation of the academic chairperson.
- 496 • Additional recommendations to be added by the college PTR committee
497 and the Dean.

498 **Section VI**

- 499 • Information added (if needed), as specified in IV, D, 5 above.

D. **Student Evaluations**

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

E. **Peer Teaching Evaluations**

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

F. **Lecturers**

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

G. **File Integrity**

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

H. **SENTF**

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

I. **Chairpersons' Annual Report**

All chairs and program directors (with faculty) shall complete the Chairperson's Annual Report and Chairperson Annual Workload Planning (CAR and CAWP,

545 see Section VII) and Workload Agreement and include
546 these in their evaluation portfolios.

V. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

A. Overview

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

B. Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

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

3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as

594 examples of such wider processes).

4. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTR calendar.

C. Evaluation of Teaching and Advising

The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal

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

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

1. Self-evaluation and course materials

- a. The faculty member's evaluation of their own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to which the faculty member wishes to call attention and should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair evaluations as appropriate.
- b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and

should contain those elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.

- c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.
- d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall be made available to faculty members for review and shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental and college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course syllabi, the difficulty of the material taught, the course workload, and the evaluations of students and peers.

2.

Evaluation of teaching by students

- a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.
- b. Unless the History Department as a whole votes to develop its own form, the PTR process will use the university-wide system. The History Department may opt to recommend the cumulative use of two evaluation forms.
- c. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, hybrid, and study abroad courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.

3.

Evaluation of teaching by tenured peers

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

- 685 c. At a minimum, peer evaluations will be performed by History
686 PTR Committee members once each year for Assistant Professors
687 Tenured Associate Professors should also be evaluated at least once
688 a year.
689 Tenured Full Professors should be evaluated every other year with
690 at least two evaluations completed for each five-year review. Full
691 time lecturers and visiting assistant professors who will be at
692 Towson more than one academic year will be evaluated once each
693 academic year. These guidelines do not
694 include summer or mini-mester teaching.
- 695 At the start of each academic year, the History PTR Committee
696 Chair will select a two-person subcommittee, based on a rotating
697 list to develop a list of evaluators and courses to evaluate in
698 consultation with faculty. Membership of this subcommittee will
699 be on a rotating basis. The Subcommittee members will select a
700 Chair. A preliminary list of peer evaluators (who must be tenured
701 faculty) and classes to evaluate will be completed in the first three
702 weeks of each semester. Non-tenured faculty (Assistant
703 Professors) may observe the teaching of Lecturers and Adjuncts.
- 704 d. In every case the evaluator shall strive to choose a class meeting
705 most amenable to the individual under evaluation. The faculty
706 member being evaluated will have at least two weeks notice of any
707 peer review. The evaluation shall not be performed in the final
708 two weeks of the semester unless requested by the faculty member
709 being evaluated. Evaluations must be completed, reviewed, signed,
710 and filed with the History Department by the end of the semester in
711 which they were performed. It is the responsibility of the PTR
712 Chair to ensure these are completed.
- 713 4. Evaluation of advising
- 715 a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of
716 meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their
717 academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor
718 provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding
719 available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative
720 courses of action.
- 722 b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning
723 process within one's class-teaching responsibilities, advising

groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research committee, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.

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

D. Scholarship

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

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

2. In presenting their scholarship for review or in evaluating the work of others, faculty shall be guided by the definitions of scholarship noted above. The forms of scholarly publication faculty members produce differ among fields; it is therefore the responsibility of faculty members to explain how their scholarship fits the norms of their field and contributes

775 to their scholarly growth. These forms of scholarship may, but not
776 exclusively, consist of

- 777
- 778 a. Scholarly monographs based on original research, subject to peer
779 review, and disseminated to the scholarly community by a
780 university press (or its equivalent).
- 781
- 782 b. Scholarly journal articles (published in print or digitally) or
783 book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally) based on
784 original research, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the
785 scholarly community.
- 786
- 787 c. Scholarly edited article or essay collections (published in print
788 or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to the
789 scholarly community.
- 790
- 791 d. Scholarly historiographic journal articles (published in print
792 or digitally) or book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally),
793 subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly
794 community.
- 795
- 796 e. Translations and/or document collections (published in print
797 or digitally) that contain scholarly notes and discussions, subject to
798 peer review and disseminated to the scholarly community.
- 799
- 800 f. Museum or public history exhibitions (whether physical or digital)
801 based on scholarly research, and
802 disseminated to the scholarly community when the faculty member
803 acts as curator.
- 804
- 805 g. Bibliographies, resource guides, and research aides (published in
806 print or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to
807 the scholarly community.
- 808
- 809 h. Public history or other research and public dissemination of
810 scholarship. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion
811 and/or tenure to make clear how these efforts illustrate intellectual
812 rigor and make a contribution to his or her field.
- 813
- 814 i. Co-authored, co-edited, and collaborative examples of any of the
815 above forms of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the individual
816 to make clear their contributions to the work.
- 817

818 3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a
819 record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or
820 promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed

work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues.

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

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

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

E. Service

To the extent possible, evaluation of service should consider the extent and

quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a

position

866 held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of

867 service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for
868 judgment
869 of its relation to the mission of the university or the faculty member's field.

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

874
875 2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local,
876 regional, national or global).

877
878 3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations
or
879 participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional,
880 national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance
881 the university's mission.
882

883 F. Chairpersons

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

905 G. Reappointment

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

908 Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated based on their success at meeting the
909 requirements of the SENTF, and their gradual progress toward meeting the

910 university, CLA, and History Department standards for promotion and tenure as

911 detailed below. A steadily expanding rotation of courses taught, strong teaching

912 skills, increasing service duties, and a growing reputation as a scholar are
913 important guideposts.

914
915 Lecturers and visiting assistant professors serving more than one academic year
916 will be evaluated based on their commitment to excellent and innovative teaching
917 through student evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, and the lecturer/VAP
918 folder.

919
920 H. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the College

921 of Liberal Arts and tenure shall include the following. There may be unusual
922 circumstances when the History PTR Committee choose to grant tenure but not
923 support immediate promotion.

- 924
925 1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Professor
926 shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of
927 specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance
928 commensurate with the University's mission.
929
930 2. The faculty member shall have demonstrated excellence in
931 teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio
932 and the criteria of the department and college, and as defined by section V
933 above.
934
935 3. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in
936 research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards
937 of dissemination and validation. At a minimum faculty are expected to
938 publish three (3) peer-reviewed articles/ book chapters or one (1)
939 monograph as defined by section V above. The History PTR
940 Committee would expect a larger output—four or five items--of the other
941 items detailed in the scholarship section above. While it is understood that
942 faculty's academic interests will evolve, it is expected that their
943 scholarship remain consistent with historical study and related fields.
944

945 In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure,
946 the History PTR Committee will consider anything published after the
947 faculty member began his or her tenure track position at Towson and
948 anything under contract prior to completing the promotion and tenure
949 folder for consideration by the Committee. If a work is under contract the
950 faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent
951 of progress. In order to be counted for tenure, articles and book manuscripts
must be submitted either published or in proof, with the proof accompanied
with supporting material from a book or journal editor about the date of
final publication.

- 952
953 4. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and
954 effective service, as defined in Section V. Standards and Criteria of this

955
956

document.

I. Third-Year Review

The expectations for the Third-Year Review are based on progress toward promotion and tenure as detailed above. The three levels of progress are as follows:

- Superior. Requirements include excellence in teaching (in all its components including advising), excellence in scholarship and meeting department standards in service.
- Satisfactory. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This essentially means that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.
- Unsatisfactory. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

J. Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure, the History PTR Committee will consider anything published while the faculty member served as an associate professor. If a work is under contract the faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent of progress. However, if the item was in proof prior to the History Department PTR committee's recommendation on promotion

and
tenure, , it
may not
be used
for the

promotion to full professor. In short, any scholarship, whether under contract or in the final published version, may only be counted once. Finally, anything published after the file for promotion to associate professor and tenure was completed may be used for the promotion to full professor.

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

K. Five-Year Comprehensive Review

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

1. Positive. Requirements include maintaining excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department.
2. Negative. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions: teaching, service, or scholarship. This essentially marks a clear decline from the accomplishments that justified promotion to full professor or the satisfactory record of a previous Five-Year Comprehensive Review.

L. Exceptions

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

M. Merit

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

1. Not Meritorious (No Merit): Performance fails adequately to meet standards.

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

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

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

VI. CALENDAR

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

1084 **Appendix A**

1085 **College of Liberal Arts Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit,**
1086 **Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar**

1087
1088 **The First Friday in May**

1089 Department and college PTR committees are formed (elections for membership on the college
1090 committee are already completed)

1091
1092 **The Third Friday in June**

1093 All faculty members submit a portfolio to the department chair.

1094 A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on
1095 department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chairperson and
1096 dean.

1097 B. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by
1098 Chair and Dean of the written professional development plan.

1099
1100 **August 1 (USM mandated)**

1101 Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of
1102 non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty
1103 member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a
1104 modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a of Appendix 3 of the ART
1105 policy.

1106
1107 **The First Friday in September**

1108 Department chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the
1109 department tenure and/or promotion committee

1110
1111 **The Second Friday in September**

1112 University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive
1113 Committee's Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.

1114
1115 **The Third Friday in September**

1116 A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure
1117 in the next academic year.

1118 B. College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTR
1119 committee (if necessary).

1120 C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was
1121 completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a.

1122 D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for
1123 New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

1124
1125 **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 PTR committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.

B. College PTR 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 PTR 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 PTR committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTR chairperson to the dean's office.

November 30th

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

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

The First Friday in December

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTR 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 PTR committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

B. The college PTR 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. on and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

T
h
e

d
e
a
n
,
s

w
r
i
t
t
e
n

e
v
a
l
u
a
t
i
o
n

r
e
g
a
r
d
i
n
g

p
r
o
m
o
t
i

1172 B. The college PTR committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's
1173 recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

1174 C. The department PTR committee and chairperson recommendations concerning
1175 reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the
1176 dean.

1177 D. All documentation for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the
1178 faculty member to the department chairperson.

1179 E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to
1180 the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

1181
1182 **The First Friday in February**

1183 A. The college Dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the
1184 Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning
1185 promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

1186 B. The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to
1187 the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean shall
1188 prepare thier own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this
1189 recommendation to the summative portfolio.

1190
1191 **The Second Friday in February**

1192 A. The Dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty
1193 merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall
1194 add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the
1195 negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

1196 B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an
1197 approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM
1198 committee.

1199 C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the
1200 Provost to the President.

1201
1202 **March 1**

1203 First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the
1204 university President.

1205
1206 **First Friday in March**

1207 Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their
1208 performance toward tenure.

1209
1210 **Third Friday in March**

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