

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

**REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE,
AND MERIT APPEAL DOCUMENT**

Approved by department: December 2023

Approved by College of Liberal Arts PTR Committee: December 21, 2023

Approved by Dean of the College of Liberal Arts:

Approved by the UPTRM:

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND MERIT APPEAL DOCUMENT
Revised December 2023**

Table of Contents

Section	Page
I. PRESUMPTIONS GOVERNING DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT DECISIONS	2
II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND CLINICAL EVALUATION, COMMITTEES	
A. The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee	2
B. The Clinical Evaluation Committee	3
III. VOTING PROCEDURES, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND NOTIFICATION	3
IV. STANDARDS AND PORTFOLIO EXPECTATIONS	4
A. Reference to University ART	5
B. University Standards and Expectations	5
C. The Portfolio	5
D. Scope of Teaching	6
E. Evaluation of Teaching	6
F. Evaluation of Scholarship	7
G. Evaluation of Service	9
H. Evaluation of Department Chair	9
V. SUMMATIVE PORTFOLIO FOR THE PROVOST	9
VI. TYPES OF REVIEWS AND DECISIONS	
A. Merit and Appeals to Merit	11
B. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty	12
C. Third-Year Review of Tenure-track Faculty	13
D. Tenure and/or Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty	14
E. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty	16
F. Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty	16
VII. CALENDAR	19
Appendix: Peer Teaching Evaluations	20

Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy of Towson University and its appendices, the CLA PTRM document, as well as the Senate resolution on merit that was passed on April 4th, 2022, the UPTRM motion on first year tenure-track faculty review (passed on October 17th, 2019), and the recommendations from the Provost's Office on Voting Procedures for Remote PTRM Deliberations.

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

- A. The promotion and tenure policies and procedures of the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department follow those established in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) of Faculty (02-01.00) and are in accordance with the Policies and Procedures of the College of Liberal Arts Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment [PTR] Committee.
- B. Faculty members are responsible for providing the departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee with any and all required forms and other materials in support of their candidacy for promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit in a timely and professional manner. Failure to do so is sufficient cause for the Committee to deny promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit.
- C. Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice faculty are defined as those holding full-time tenured, tenure-track, or clinical appointments in the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department, or joint tenured or tenure-track appointments with another department or in an administrative position.
- D. Review and Changes to Document: Every three years after the first approval of this document, the Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice Department in its entirety will review this document. Any changes must be approved by a majority of the tenure line faculty and forwarded to the college PTR committee for approval.

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND CLINICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEES

- A. **The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee** evaluates tenure-track and tenured faculty in terms of reappointment, promotion, tenure, third-year reviews, comprehensive reviews, and merit appeals. It consists of all faculty members in the department with tenure at the time of committee deliberations, and membership on this committee is restricted to tenured faculty members. Faculty members who are on sabbatical may participate on the committee, provided that they have reviewed the material and are present for deliberations. All votes require a quorum of 75% of the membership. The Departmental Chair serves ex officio and does not vote.
 - 1. Each year, by the first Friday in May, the PTR Committee must vote on a Chair of the committee. Whenever the Chair of the PTR Committee is absent, the most senior member of the remaining committee serves in his or her place.

2. The Chair of the PTR Committee shall have the following responsibilities:

- a. To call and conduct meetings of the PTR Committee. The Chair will participate in all deliberations of the Committee, except when one's own record is being reviewed. The Chair will vote on all tenure decisions. The Chair will vote on promotion decisions for colleagues of academic rank junior to one's own.
- b. To provide reasonable counsel to faculty members in gathering materials, preparing forms, and assembling dossiers for use in promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit appeal deliberations.
- c. To give formal written notice of reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions, and recommendations from the Third-Year/Comprehensive reviews, and merit appeals to the department chairperson and to the proper College and University authorities and committees. The written statements shall reflect the sum and substance of the discussion of the PTR Committee.
- d. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of the written recommendations to faculty deriving from promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions.
- e. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of the written recommendations to faculty deriving from Third-Year and Comprehensive Reviews.
- f. To participate with the department chair in the presentation of written reasons to faculty in cases of non-reappointment or non-recommendation for tenure or promotion.
- g. To ensure that the DSR form indicating the decisions made is completed and signed by the department PTR chair and each faculty member being reviewed.

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

III. VOTING PROCEDURES, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND NOTIFICATION

- A. All voting for each type of review specified in this document shall be by confidential ballot cast upon completion of the discussion of each candidate.
- B. The Department PTR Committee follows the procedures established in Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty and the Provost's guidelines for voting procedures using TU approved web-based programs. All ballots must collect the Faculty ID number. Any voting mechanism, whether electronic or paper, must be secure and allow for records retention

in accordance with USM records retention policies. While it is not necessary to use the TU Ballot Summary, a paper copy of the electronic voting record, which includes a record of faculty ID numbers associated with each ballot, must be printed and kept on file per the ART policy.

- C. Votes shall be tallied by the department PTR committee chair. The committee chair will forward to the dean (or the college PTR Committee) a signed, dated report of the results of the vote along with the committee's recommendation. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded under separate cover to the Dean (or the college PTR Committee).
- D. Favorable decisions require a majority vote of eligible voters supporting any motion. A motion will fail in the case of a tie vote.
- E. Committee members must be present in order to vote. No member of the PTR Committee shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest
- F. Votes involving appeal shall be by confidential ballot as well and tallied by the PTR chair. The results shall be entered on a single sheet of paper labeled with the name of the faculty member being evaluated, the department name, and the date. Members of the committee will each sign the report to confirm their participation and the result as recorded. The record of the vote will be forwarded to the Dean who shall maintain these documents for three years.
- G. Members of the PTR Committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning deliberations and recommendations, including votes cast, at all points during and after any review process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.
- H. A written statement of the department PTR committee, including the committee's recommendation and a record of the vote count, shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the department PTR chair and be made available to the chair of the department by the second Friday in October. The department chair shall assist with the electronic posting process.
- I. The department chair shall prepare a separate independent written statement of evaluation that is posted to the electronic evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
- J. The department PTR letter and the chair written statement of evaluation shall be delivered (or sent via the University approved secure delivery system) to the faculty member being reviewed by the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the department chair or sent via a secure delivery system with return receipt no later than also the fourth Friday in October.

IV. STANDARDS AND PORTFOLIO EXPECTATIONS

- A. As specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy, the standards and expectations in this document pertain to the evaluation processes associated with annual reviews, reappointment, third-year review, appeals to merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review.
- B. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for any type of review shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role and expectations for faculty at the university, college, and department levels. Evaluation portfolios shall be submitted as an electronic portfolio to the University's approved system. Portfolios should be organized with clarity and thoroughness. While the faculty member has the freedom to include materials deemed pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged.
- C. All faculty are responsible for meeting University standards and expectations for their rank, 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. Faculty members shall fulfill their workload agreements 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. Faculty members shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
 3. Faculty members shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
 4. Faculty members 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.
 5. Faculty members shall share the responsibility of university, college, and 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.
 6. Faculty members shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRM calendar.

D. The scope of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, attention to pedagogy connected with the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It includes as assigned academic advising, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context.

E. 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. Faculty members' 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. This narrative statement should also address the faculty members' self-evaluation of their advising.
- 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.

2. Evaluation of teaching by students

- a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.
- b. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.

3. Evaluation of teaching by 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.
- b. Prior to tenure, tenure-track faculty require one peer review per year. After tenure, two peer reviews of teaching are required per 5-year period. One peer review is required per reappointment period for clinical faculty and lecturers.
- c. Advance notice of at least one (1) week shall be given to the faculty member being observed.
- d. Reviewers are expected to include observations and assessments about the following aspects of instruction in their written evaluation of a specific course: (a) the course syllabus; (b) the quality of the instructor's presentation of course content; and (c) the quality of the instructor's interaction with students. Syllabus reviews may include comments about assigned texts or readings and course assignments. Comments about other aspects of teaching, such as the use of technology and special class activities or methods of encouraging student class participation, can also be included in reports of peer evaluation of teaching.

4. Evaluation of advising

- a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.
- b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research committee, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.
- c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio.

F. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's commitment 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, faculty members shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in their academic fields, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly 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, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and professional arts.
 - b. *Scholarship of Discovery* – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and professional arts.
 - c. *Scholarship of Integration* – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
 - d. *Scholarship of Teaching* – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning.
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.
3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues. A faculty member's portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a pattern of completed work consistent with the nature of the faculty member's appointment.
4. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or international, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
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.

G. The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allocated for service in the faculty member's workload agreements. To the extent possible, evaluation should consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment of its extent and its relation to the mission of the university.

1. University service involves substantive participation in the shared governance activities of the department, college, and university.
2. Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university's mission.
3. Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national, or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission.

H. Chairs, who are responsible for supervising faculty, shall be evaluated in the additional category of leadership. Chair activities are reported as part of their annual review on the CAR form and constitute a minimum of fifty percent of the chair's workload by university policy. Departments shall recognize in their evaluation of chairs a distribution of responsibilities and expectations consistent with the chair's workload agreements. Evaluators will recognize that chair responsibilities may involve personnel matters or dealings with students governed by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Program directors who supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to such work under their workload agreements.

V. SUMMATIVE PORTFOLIO FOR THE PROVOST

A. In addition to the full evaluation portfolio used by the department and college, faculty being reviewed for promotion, tenure, or five-year review shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost to accompany the full evaluation portfolio from the beginning of the process. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. In each section of the portfolio, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of the start of the review period. The summative portfolio shall be compiled, labeled and indexed as follows:

Section I

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

Section II

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report and Annual Workload Plan or Chairperson's Annual Report and Chairperson's Annual Workload Plan forms arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time.
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Peer teaching evaluations.

Section IV

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

Section V

- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party at the appropriate stage).
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form.
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson.
- Additional recommendations to be added by the college PTR committee and the academic dean.

Section VI

- Information added (if needed), as specified in IV, B, 5 above.

VI. TYPES OF REVIEWS AND DECISIONS

A. Merit and Appeals to Merit

1. The Department of Sociology, Anthropology & Criminal Justice follows the procedures and calendar of the Towson University Policy on Merit. It should be noted that this policy has and may change from time to time.
2. Currently there are two categories of merit as follows:
 - a. Not Meritorious – A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of Section V.A of the Bylaws of the CLA PTR Committee or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with these expectations.
 - b. Merit – A rating of Merit shall mean that the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in Section V.A of this same College document. This includes that faculty members have: (i) fulfilled their workload agreements in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service; (ii) been available to students for consultation and advising during office hours; (iii) met all classes as scheduled; (iv) demonstrated a commitment to collegiality and citizenship; (v) and participated in governance at the department level.
3. Faculty should consult department bylaws for further discussion of meritorious indicators for teaching, scholarship, and service. Expectations for merit vary based on workload allocations. A higher teaching load correlates with lower expectations for scholarship and/or service, while a lower teaching load means higher scholarship and service expectations.
 - a. The Department recognizes that there are many ways faculty members may demonstrate a performance of merit.
4. The PTR Committee shall review as needed appeals to merit for lecturers, clinical, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Only negative decisions can be appealed. All appeals by faculty are made in writing. Merit appeals shall follow the current full-time faculty merit process and calendar of merit evaluation in use at the time.
5. A quorum of the PTR Committee for hearing appeals shall consist of 75% of voting members.
6. Faculty members may also submit procedural appeals to the UPTRM Committee, or appeals alleging unlawful discrimination, as provided for in the university ART policy, Appendix 3, and Towson University policy 06-01.00.

Note that the Chair must meet the previously stated standards for merit and, also provide evidence of effectiveness in departmental leadership and management to receive merit.

B. Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. The PTR Committee votes on reappointment decisions for tenure-track faculty in the second year. It also votes on appeals to negative reappointment decisions made by the Chair in other years. With regard to reappointment votes, eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank equal to or superior to the person under review. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members.

2. Reappointment: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty

The Department follows the college document in the reappointment of first year tenure-track faculty. First-year tenure-track faculty will complete the Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form in cooperation with the department Chair by third Friday in September. The reappointment process will begin by the third Friday in January, when the faculty member will submit the SENTF, syllabi, and student/peer evaluations to the department Chair. The department Chair will make a recommendation regarding the reappointment of the faculty member; this recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department PTR Committee, Dean, and the Provost by the first Friday in February. In the case of a recommendation AGAINST reappointment by the department Chair, the department PTR committee will make its own independent recommendation; this recommendation will be forwarded by the committee Chair to the faculty member, the department Chair, Dean, and the Provost by the third Friday of February, at which point the faculty member may prepare an appeal to the President. In the case of a recommendation AGAINST reappointment by the department Chair, the Dean will make a recommendation regarding the reappointment of the first-year tenure-track faculty; this recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department Chair, the department PTR Committee Chair, and the Provost by the fourth Friday in February. The Provost will make a recommendation to the President by March 1st; the faculty member will have ten business days to appeal a negative decision to the President, who shall make the final decision. This process is described in Appendix B, "First-Year Flowchart", located in the Bylaws of the CLA PTR Committee.

3. Reappointment: Second-Year Tenure-Track Faculty

- a. Faculty members shall prepare a full evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments at the conclusion of their first year. The evaluation portfolio shall include an updated curriculum vita, syllabi of current courses, student evaluations for all course sections taught, the required number of peer observations, documentation of scholarship and service activities, and a reflective summary of teaching, scholarship, and service. (Please note: The reappointment portfolio is more extensive than materials submitted for merit consideration.)
- b. The department PTR committee shall evaluate second year tenure-track faculty and make a written recommendation regarding reappointment.
- c. The department chairperson prepares an independent recommendation for reappointment and includes it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

- d. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count.
 - e. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent via a secure delivery system in use by the university.
 - f. The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendations of the PTR committee and the department chairperson shall be forwarded by the department PTR committee chairperson to the CLA Dean's office by no later than the second Friday in November.
 - g. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy; however, an appeal will not stay the reappointment evaluation process.
4. Reappointment: Third- through Fifth-Year Tenure-Track Faculty
- a. USM Policy II-1.00 Section I.C.3. provides that the appointments of faculty entering the third through fifth years of service will automatically renew for one additional year unless notice of non-reappointment is provided by August 1 prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service as applicable.

C. Third-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the PTR Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. The PTR Committee evaluation of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and will be shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTR Committee or the Provost.
2. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the PTR Committee as outlined in the section "Documentation and Material Inclusion" (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy. The portfolio must include:
 - A narrative statement describing how the candidate has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations over the review period.
 - The contents of the Annual Review dossiers from the previous two full years of service at Towson University, which must include for each year: Annual Report and Annual Workload Plans or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report) signed by faculty member, chair, and dean; curriculum vitae; syllabi of courses taught in the year being reviewed; student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising; evidence of scholarship; and evidence of service.

- Material from the Fall semester of the third year, including: curriculum vitae; syllabi of courses taught that semester; at least one peer evaluation of teaching conducted during the Fall semester of the third year; student evaluations of teaching for courses taught during the Fall semester of the third year; evidence of scholarship; and evidence of service.

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

- a. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading to a positive promotion and tenure decision, and
- b. must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

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

- a. Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
- b. Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This ranking indicates that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are needed.
- c. Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

5. The 3rd year review portfolio from the faculty member is due to the chair of the department by the third Friday in January.

6. Feedback shall be in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the chair of the PTR Committee no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean and sent to the candidate via the university approved secure delivery system.

D. Tenure and/or Promotion of Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty

1. The PTR Committee votes on tenure and promotion decisions. For tenure decisions, all tenured faculty vote. With regard to promotion, eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank superior to the person under review. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members.
2. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but forwarded by the chair of the Department in accordance with the ART policy. The department

PTR committee as specified above shall meet and evaluate all faculty up for tenure and/or promotion and make a written recommendation.

3. The department chairperson prepares an independent recommendation and includes it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

4. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count.

5. Negative recommendations about tenure and/or promotion shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent via a secure delivery system in use by the university.

6. The faculty member's entire evaluation record, inclusive of the written recommendations of the PTR committee and the department chairperson, shall be forwarded by the department PTR committee chairperson to the CLA Dean's office by no later than the second Friday in November.

7. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, V.

8. The expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice shall include the following:

- a. The faculty member recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards of dissemination and validation, and shown competence to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research when applicable. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, as defined in section IV, G above.
- b. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Full Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. 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. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards of dissemination and validation expected for the prior rank. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent with establishing a sound scholarly reputation. 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.

9. 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.

E. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

1. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years. The criteria for the Comprehensive Review are drawn from APPENDIX 3 TO THE TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK, AND TENURE OF FACULTY. The chair of the department, in consultation with the dean of the college shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the department. Faculty members who have submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of their comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the dean of the college.

2. The PTR Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios of faculty members standing for their Comprehensive Five-Year Review and prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count. Eligible voters include tenured faculty with rank superior to the person under review, with the exception of full professors, who also vote on those with equal rank to their own. A quorum will consist of 75% of the eligible committee members. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and service.

3. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

4. The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department committee, the written evaluation of the department chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the chair of the PTR Committee to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.

5. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and the dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair and dean.

F. Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty

1. The Clinical Evaluation Committee votes on reappointment decisions for clinical faculty. A quorum will consist of 75% of the committee members.

2. Reappointment: First-year Clinical Faculty

- a. Evaluation procedures for reappointment of Clinical Faculty in their first-year of appointment shall be the same as the evaluation procedures for reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty as set forth in this department document.
- b. The same timeline and appeal procedures set forth for reappointment of first-year tenure track-faculty shall apply to the first-year reappointment of clinical faculty.
- c. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent via a secure delivery system in use by the university.
- d. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, V.

3. Reappointment: Annual Reappointment of Clinical Faculty after the First Year

- a. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will follow 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit, V., C. & D.
- b. The department Clinical Evaluation Committee shall evaluate Clinical Faculty regarding reappointment after their first year. The Clinical Evaluation Committee shall prepare a written report, with vote count. The recommendation for reappointment shall contain reference to each category evaluated.
- c. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent recommendation for each clinical faculty member reviewed for reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by no later than the fourth Friday in October.
- d. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October.
- e. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent via a secure delivery system in use by the university.
- f. The faculty member's Evaluation Record, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department chairperson should be forwarded by the department PTR committee chair to the CLA Dean's office by no later than the second Friday in November.
- g. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in Appendix 3 of the University ART policy; however, an appeal will not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

4. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

- a. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will be the same as the PTR Committee with the addition of a clinical faculty member who is in the role of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor within the College of Liberal Arts. If a Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor is not available within the College of Liberal Arts, a faculty member from another college at that level will be added to the committee. The external clinical Committee member has full voting privileges on the Committee.
- b. The Committee will review portfolios for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor. The Committee shall prepare a written report with recommendations and vote count. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated, including teaching, advising (as applicable), scholarship, administrative accomplishment, and service.
- c. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent evaluation of each clinical faculty member considered for promotion and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
- d. The Committee's recommendation and the department chair's recommendation shall be conveyed in writing to the clinical faculty member, including a record of the vote count, no later than the fourth Friday in October.
- e. Negative recommendations for promotion shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent via a secure delivery system in use by the university.
- f. Procedures for further steps in the evaluation process and for appeal of negative recommendations are given in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, V.
- g. The chair of the Clinical Evaluation Committee shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record, to the CLA Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
- h. The expectations for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice include the following:
 - i. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University's mission.
 - ii. The faculty member ordinarily will have demonstrated excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college.

- iii. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service.
 - iv. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor shall have had extensive successful experience in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, or in a subdivision of the department field, and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate, and/or undergraduate students) in applied clinical activities in the discipline. The appointee must also have demonstrated superior teaching ability and scholarly or administrative accomplishments, including but not limited to the writing and dissemination of reports and other forms of alternative scholarship, demonstrable engagement with and outreach to the community, and continued professional development and maintenance of professional credentials, when applicable.
 - v. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Clinical Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Clinical Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and scholarship. The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Clinical Professor at least equivalent to the pattern of completed work meeting the standards expected for the prior rank. 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 Clinical Associate professor.
5. 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.
6. Three Year Appointment for Clinical Faculty
- a. Upon request by the Clinical Faculty member, Clinical Faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and higher may be considered for a three-year contract. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will follow procedures set forth in the 02-01.08 Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Section: V.,D.,12.

VII. CALENDAR

The Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Department will abide by the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar as published in Appendix 3, VI, of the ART Policy, with the understanding that if the published university calendar changes, the Sociology, Anthropology

and Criminal Justice PTRM calendar may change without formal amendment of the departmental document.

Appendix: Peer Teaching Evaluations

Towson's ART requires that departments "develop discipline-specific criteria or guidelines for performing and reporting classroom/clinical observations," and that these be included in the department PTRM document.

In completing written peer teaching evaluations, reviewers observe and comment on the following aspects of their observation:

- a. the course syllabus--syllabus reviews may include comments about assigned texts or readings and course assignments;
- b. the quality of the instructor's presentation of course content;
- c. the quality of the instructor's interaction with students.

Comments about other aspects of teaching, such as the use of technology, special class activities, or methods of encouraging student class participation, can also be included in reports of peer evaluation of teaching.

Copies of written peer evaluations must be submitted to both the faculty member and the department chair, as soon as possible after the peer observation.

Faculty members are responsible for making sure they have the required number and frequency of peer evaluations for each type of review, as outlined in the Department PTRM document (IV., E.,3., b.).