

SCED PTRM document--final approved version—2011
SCED PTRM document – amended as directed -3/27/2013
SCED PTRM document – amended as directed -4/15/2013
SCED PTRM document – amended as directed – 12/3/2015
SMED PTRM document – proposed changes as of 1/15/2024
SMED PTRM document – May, 2024 – revisions suggested by UPRM are highlighted –
comments by reviewers are additionally noted.
September, 2024 – All suggestions for revisions from UTPRM are made



**Towson University
College of Education**

**DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY and MIDDLE SCHOOL
EDUCATION**

**Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, and Merit Policies and
Procedures**

Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, and Merit Procedures

Introduction	p. 3
I. Standards and Expectations	p. 4
A. The Faculty Member	p. 4
B. The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education	p. 4
II. Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	p. 5
A. Action-Review Years' Dossiers and Documentation	p. 5-6
B. Department Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. 1. Teaching 2. Scholarship 3. Service	p. 6-9
C. Committee Procedures 1. Committee Constituency 2. Voting Procedures 3. Reporting Procedures 4. Tenure-track First Year Review 5. Tenure-track Reappointment 6. Third-Year Review 7. Comprehensive 5-year Review	p. 9-15
III. Department Merit Policy for All Full Time Faculty	p. 16
A. Merit Policy	p. 16
B. Annual Evaluation Portfolios	p. 16
C. Relationship between Standards for Promotion/Reappointment/Tenure and Merit	p. 16
D. Department Standards for Merit	p. 16-17
E. Faculty on leave	p. 18
IV. Lecturers	p. 19
A. Standards and Expectations	p. 19
B. Lecturer Merit	p. 19
C. Annual Review Dossier	p. 19
D. Student Evaluation of Teaching	p. 19
E. Peer Observations	p. 19-20
F. Promotion to Lecturer II	p. 20
G. Promotion to Lecturer III	p. 20-21
V. Negative Recommendations and Appeals	p. 22-23
VI. Approval of this Department of Secondary and Middle School Education Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Procedures Document	p. 24
VII. Calendar	p. 25-29
VIII. Appendices	p. 30-34

Towson University
College of Education
DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY AND MIDDLE EDUCATION

Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, and Merit Policies and Procedures

Introduction:

The Department of Secondary and School Middle Education (SMED) must adhere to the promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, comprehensive review and merit procedures of the University of Maryland system, the Towson University procedures outlined in the TU ART document, and the College of Education procedures delineated in the COE PTRM document. Each member of the SMED Department is responsible for accessing, reading, and adhering to the guidelines in these documents. The purpose of this Department of Secondary and Middle School Education *Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, and Merit Procedures* document is not to replicate information (except for emphasis or background) contained in the system, University, or College documents, but to articulate procedures delegated and specific to the Department of Secondary and Middle School Education.

I. Standards and Expectations

A. The Faculty Member is expected to:

1. Demonstrate commitment to the teaching profession and to the preparation of quality instruction in secondary schools;
2. Maintain high standards of University instruction using a variety of interactive methods and resources, in support of the mission of preparing facilitators of active learning;
3. Demonstrate collegiality, including professional and ethical behavior with colleagues and students;
4. Participate fully in evaluation, development, and improvement of Towson University's secondary education programs, materials and techniques;
5. Maintain objectivity in presenting areas of knowledge and technique;
6. Serve on University, College, and Department Committees and with other professional organizations focused on education;
7. Meet all class responsibilities and follow all administrative directives regarding record keeping, grading, examinations, etc.;
8. Prepare adequate outlines, bibliographies, syllabi, and examinations and/or other means of evaluation as aids to student progress and growth;
9. Affiliate with, and participate in, professional organizations or associations related to the profession;
10. Develop, complete, and submit according to policy and procedures all required reports as requested by University, College, or Department;
11. Be knowledgeable of procedures established by the System, University, College, and Department Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Comprehensive Review for evaluation of faculty members and cooperate in their implementation and in the further development of fair and valid evaluation procedures;
12. Continue to develop through professional study, formally and informally, in order to achieve promotion, tenure, and merit;
13. Advise undergraduate and/or graduate students, as assigned;
14. Demonstrate initiative by contributing ideas to the furtherance of the Department mission; and
15. Support, through action and word, the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the Department, College, and University.

B. The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education (SMED) is expected to:

1. Inform faculty members of new policies and procedures and new program development;
2. Aid new faculty members through a program of orientation and mentoring;
3. Provide Departmental information regarding promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit policies and procedures established by the System, University, College and Department;
4. Support faculty interests and needs consistent with the mission of the Department;
5. Seek the advice and ideas of faculty members in order to make use of their unique talents, training, and experience.

II. **Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

A. Action-Review Years' Portfolios and Documentation: For action-year reviews, including tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor, and five-year reviews, faculty will use the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost. The faculty member will compile the portfolio in compliance with the TU ART Policy (see Appendix 3, sections I.B.9 and I.B.10) Within the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost, in the *Supplementary Materials* section, the faculty member will compile documentation of the following, organized in main three sub-folders for *Scholarship, Teaching, and Service*. *Note that the COE Workload Document should lead to any decisions about distinguishing what work should be documented in each category of scholarship, teaching, and service.*

1. **Scholarship subfolder, which would include:**

- a. Organization of evidence of scholarship in a reader-accessible way via a leading table of contents and well-labeled subfolders and files.
- b. *Published scholarship* subfolder to include: Full-text copies of published scholarship for the years under review. For forthcoming published work, a letter of acceptance should be included along with a copy of the work.
- c. *Conference Presentations* subfolder to include: Including, but not limited to peer-reviewed published proceedings, presentations at academic conferences, or more. (Documentation could include letters of acceptance, presentation materials, excerpts from conference agendas, etc.)
- d. If applicable, additional subfolders should include:
 - i. Program evaluation work and/or national accreditation reports;
 - ii. Product design/development/testing;
 - iii. Community engagement scholarship;
 - iv. Evidence/documentation of applications/awards for grants and additional funding; and/or
 - v. Mentoring of student scholarship.
- e. It is the faculty's responsibility to support the determination of sufficiency of quality of scholarship as they determine necessary.

2. **Teaching subfolder, which would include:**

- a. Organization of evidence of teaching in a reader-accessible way via a leading table of contents and well-labeled subfolders and files.
- b. *Syllabi* subfolder to include syllabi for each course for each semester and year
- c. *Student Evaluations* subfolder to include student evaluation for each year and each course
- d. If applicable, the following should be included in additional subfolders:
 - i. Advising Evaluations for each semester and year;
 - ii. Leadership in department or program-specific areas of teaching and instruction;
 - iii. Substantive curriculum and instructional revision (particularly if aligned to research, national accreditation, or larger programmatic efforts); and/or
 - iv. Teaching awards and recognition
- e. If the candidate seeks recognition for particular actions or accomplishments in teaching from the credited period, supporting evidence must be submitted. The following could be included

- i. Unsolicited evaluations of instruction by both current students and graduates
 - ii. Incorporation of appropriate technology in one's teaching;
 - iii. Mentoring colleagues in effective teaching and academic advising
3. **Service subfolder, which would include:**
- a. Organization of evidence of teaching in a reader accessible way via a leading table of contents and well-labeled subfolders and files.
 - b. Evidence of service activities to the discipline, university, college, department, and the greater metropolitan community for the years under review
 - c. As appropriate, the submission should also include information regarding leadership for and service activities
 - d. Note, if paid additional compensation for work, then the work cannot be claimed as service.

B. Department Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion: The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education must adhere to the promotion, tenure, comprehensive review and merit procedures of the University of Maryland system, the Towson University procedures outlined in the TU ART document, and the College of Education procedures delineated COE PTR Document. Faculty should note well these standards for teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member is responsible for showcasing his/her best work in each area of review: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. While excellence in teaching is paramount for successful promotion and tenure review at Towson University, without evidence of scholarship and the establishment of a scholarly agenda, as well as a sustained record of appropriate service, tenure and promotion will not be granted. The following table, taken from the COE PTR document, outlines the standards from promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

Table 3: College of Education Standards for Promotion and Tenure Advancement (2011)

	Promotion to Associate Professor and Advancement with Tenure	Promotion to Professor
Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent student evaluations • Excellent peer evaluations • Excellent course syllabi and instructional materials • Excellent evaluation of advising by students 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in teaching and advising.
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustained record of quality service to the University, college, department, community, and/or profession. 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in service to the University, college, and/or department. • Leadership in service to the profession.
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a programmatic anchor(s) for his/her scholarship 	In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustained record of quality scholarship, including but not limited to, peer-reviewed conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications/successful grants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of local, regional, national, or international expertise/reputation
--	--	--

1. **Teaching:** Teaching is the primary mission of Towson University and the primary responsibility of each faculty member. Faculty members are expected to model research-based, active learning strategies in accordance with the College of Education's mission. Faculty members must be rated as excellent in this area. Teaching performance will be evaluated from syllabi and instructional materials submitted and new instructional procedures and grade distributions reported in the annual dossier, peer observations and evaluation of teaching, student evaluations of teaching and advising, and the faculty member's correlation statement/self-reflection on teaching.

- a. **Peer Observation and Evaluation:**

- i. Tenure-track faculty will be visited at least once every academic year by two members of his/her Rank Committee. Tenured faculty must be visited at least twice during a review period by two members of their Rank Committee. These two members will observe the faculty member together in order to secure the reliability of observations.
- ii. Arrangements for observations will be made through the Departmental PTR Chair. Decisions concerning the identification of observers and times for observations will be made by the Departmental PTR Chair in collegial consultation with the faculty member to be observed and the Department Chair. At least one-week advance notice of the observation will be given to the faculty member and observers.
- iii. The faculty member should send observers a lesson plan for the lesson at least 24 hours in advance.
- iv. The observers must write an observation report/letter and submit it to the faculty member observed. This report/letter will include:
 - An objective description of the lesson activities;
 - A statement which evaluates: Instructional objectives set and accomplished; instructional strategies employed, including the instructor serving as a "facilitator of active learning" and modeling best practices; professional demeanor of the faculty member; and/or other (optional).
- v. A post-observation conference will take place among the faculty member and the two observers within two weeks of the observation. Both observers' signed observation reports will be presented in writing and delivered electronically to the faculty member within four weeks of the observation. The faculty member should receive, read, and sign all materials at that time. The faculty member will have two weeks to attach additional or alternative relevant information to these reports.
- vi. Should the Departmental Rank Committee wish to schedule additional

visits, the faculty member will be informed in writing of the Committee's intentions and the time and place at least a week before the scheduled visit. The faculty member's input should be solicited when scheduling the observations.

- vii. Individual faculty members may request additional visitations from one or more of their Rank Committee members.
 - b. **Student Evaluation of Teaching:** Tenured and non-tenured faculty will be evaluated by all students in all the courses taught. All faculty will use and submit only the approved University and Departmental student evaluation form. These evaluation forms are sent on-line by the University through the Towson University Office of Assessment. The quantitative and qualitative data are collected by the University through Student Voice and tabulated by the Office of Assessment. The evaluation summaries are sent to the SMED Department Chair and to the faculty member via e-mail from the Assessment Analyst in the Towson University Office of Assessment. All data will be included in the faculty member's annual dossier in the "Teaching" section.
 - c. **Student Evaluation of Advising:** While the process of advising differs between undergraduate and graduate programs, all advisors are expected to be courteous, professional, available, and informed about University, College, and Departmental policies and programs. Faculty will be assessed annually by their advisees during one of the final sessions of the SCED 499 course, using the "Secondary Education Advising Evaluation" form, approved by the Department on 3/6/00. (See Appendix C). Advising evaluations will be completed anonymously by the students and collected by the Instructors of SCED 499 and will be included in the summary of student evaluations of teaching.
 - d. **Faculty Member's Correlation Statement and Self-Reflection of Teaching:** Self-evaluation of teaching (including advising) effectiveness will be included in the correlation statement for teaching on the AR document. This will be a narrative statement about teaching effectiveness and philosophy for the academic year under review after careful review of syllabi and instructional materials submitted and new instructional procedures and grade distributions reported in the annual dossier, peer observations and evaluation of teaching, and student evaluations of teaching and advising.
2. **Scholarship:**
- a. As in the College of Education PTR document, the SMED Department has also adopted the UNISCOPE (2000) model as a guiding framework. This model defines scholarship as "...the thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge ... informed by current knowledge in the field and [is] characterized by creativity and openness to new information, debate, and criticism. For scholarly activity to be recognized, utilized, and rewarded, it must be shared with others in appropriate ways" (p. 2).
 - b. The forms of scholarship that guide our work follow in Table 1.
 - c. Appendix A provides examples of evidence for each form of scholarship, but the list is not inclusive of all products that faculty may use for the evaluation of scholarship.

Table 1: Four Forms of Scholarship (as articulated in 2010 Towson University ART Policy and COE PTR document)

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

3. **Service:** Faculty members are responsible for service to the Department, College, and University, their discipline, and the broader community including collaborations and partnerships with practitioners in the field. Service may also include civic service “that may or may not be directly related to one’s academic expertise, but in ways which advance the University’s mission” (TU ART Document). Service performance will be evaluated from evidence submitted on the faculty member’s description of specific contributions to work such as the following:
 - a. Membership on Department, College, and University Committees and/or task forces;
 - b. Leadership positions in the Department, College, and University governance structure;
 - c. Involvement in the work of practitioners in one’s field;
 - d. Involvement in professional organizations and associations in one’s field at the state, regional, national, or international level; and
 - e. Service to community associations related to the mission of the Department, College, and University.
- C. **Committee Procedures:** Deliberations by the Secondary and Middle School Education Department (SMED) are carried out according to the plan below. A quorum (simple majority) of eligible Committee members is required for all deliberations. Faculty members on sabbatical or other leave will be eligible to participate in deliberations and vote if they review the materials under consideration.
 1. **Committee Constituency**
 - a. **Departmental Representative to the College of Education (COE) Promotions, Tenure/Reappointment, and Comprehensive Review (PTR) Committee**
 - i. The positions of Departmental Representative to the College of Education (COE) Promotions, Tenure/Reappointment, and Comprehensive Review (PTR) Committee and the Chair of the SMED Department Promotions, Tenure/Reappointment, and Comprehensive Review (PTR) Committee may or may not be held by the same faculty member at the discretion of the SMED PTR Committee.
 - ii. The Departmental Representative to the College PTR Committee is nominated by the SMED Department (tenured and tenure-track members) and elected triennially by College-wide elections and may be re-elected for one additional term. At College PTR meetings, this individual

represents the College, not just the SMED Department. The Departmental Representative to the College PTR is responsible for communications between that Committee, the Chair of the SMED PTR Committee, and the SMED Department members.

b. Chair of Department PTR Committee

- i. The Chair of the SMED PTR Committee is elected by the tenured and tenure-track members of the SMED Department for a three-year term and may be re-elected for on-going terms.
- ii. The SMED Chair of the PTR Committee coordinates departmental promotions, tenure/reappointment, and comprehensive five-year review, arranges peer observations, schedules all PTR Committee meetings, ensures that Committee decisions are conveyed to faculty according to University, College, and Departmental procedures, and serves as liaison for all communications between the University and College PTR Committees and the SMED Department.
- iii. The SMED PTR Committee Chair is also responsible for delivering pertinent dossiers and other PTR materials to the College PTR Committee and/or Dean according to PTR calendar.

c. Role of the in Secondary and Middle School Department Chair in the PTR Committees: The SMED Department Chair will attend all PTR Committee meetings, will be a discussant, but will not be a voting member of PTR Committee.

d. SMED Promotions and Tenure/Reappointment Committee

- i. The SMED Promotions and Tenure/Reappointment Committee is organized as Rank Committees.
- ii. The Rank Committees are composed of the tenure-track members of the Department who hold higher academic ranks than the person to be evaluated.
- iii. The Rank Committees make all recommendations on promotion, tenure, comprehensive review and on decisions to reappoint non-tenured faculty.
- iv. The SMED Department Chairperson will attend and be a discussant but will not be a voting member of all Rank Committees.

e. Comprehensive Review Committee

- i. All tenured faculty will participate in a Comprehensive Review at least once every five years according to the policies and procedures outlined in the TU ART document.
- ii. The Comprehensive Review Committee consists of the faculty member's Rank Committee. An evaluation, based on the faculty member's electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost, in with the additional documentation required by the SMED department as outlined in section II.A of this document, is written by the Rank Committee and presented to the faculty member, the Dean of the College of Education, and is considered in decisions of promotion.

f. Non-departmental PTR Members

- i. In order that at least three (3) tenured faculty opinions be considered in promotion and tenure recommendations, in addition to the Department Chairperson, if the SMED department ever has fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members the appropriate Committee must be

supplemented with tenured faculty members from other departments within the College or from the appropriate department if the faculty member being reviewed has a joint appointment, including a joint appointment between Colleges.

- ii. The additional tenured faculty members shall be selected from a list of at least three (3) faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review.
- iii. The faculty member shall submit the list of recommended faculty members on or before the third Friday in June. The SMED Department Chair and the COE Dean will review the list from the appropriate college, delete any names they feel are inappropriate choices, and make recommendations to the COE PTR Committee by the first Friday in September.
- iv. The COE PTR Committee will select the additional faculty member(s) to be added to the Committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.

2. Voting Procedures

- a. The PTR Committee members must thoroughly read all dossiers/portfolios, with respect to Department, College, and University standards and expectations, before the Committee meeting. A faculty member who has not read all the dossiers and/or does not attend the entire Committee meeting is ineligible to vote on any cases.
- b. Each Committee member must sign the Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee Agreement (See Appendix B) to attend the meeting and participate in the discussion and voting. All discussions are confidential.
- c. The Departmental PTR Chair conducts the meeting according to Robert's Rules to allow for an orderly and thorough discussion of a faculty member's accomplishments.
- d. Per the recommendations of the Office of the Provost the SMED department will use TU's *Involved @ TU* web-based program for remote PTR voting. In the case that this remote technology is no longer available, another web-based program may be used. Any remote voting technology must include the following:
 - i. All ballots must collect the Faculty ID number.
 - ii. Any voting mechanism must be secure and allow for records retention in accordance with USM records retention policies.
 - iii. 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.
 - iv. The Department Summary Recommendation (DSR) forms must be completed with faculty member's signature acknowledging receipt of the department's decision and be retained within the Department and College Dean's office. (see Appendix D)
 - v. Note: The language listed above is taken from the UPTR website 4/13/2023.
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>
- e. A simple majority is required for decisions. No Committee member will abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention prior to the Committee

meeting.

- f. In the case of a tie vote, the Departmental PTR Chair will encourage more discussion followed by a second vote, and, if necessary, a third.
- g. In accordance with the Towson University ART document, the SMED PTR Chair will forward an electronic signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee's recommendations to the next level of review.

3. Reporting Procedures

- a. Within a month after SMED PTR Committee's deliberations and prior to the faculty member signing the Department Summary Recommendation (DSR) form, two SMED Rank Committee members, appointed by the Departmental PTR Chair, will meet with each faculty member to provide feedback to that member concerning promotion, tenure, 5-year review, or reappointment decisions.
- b. Non-tenured faculty will also be informed in writing and delivered electronically of the Rank Committee's view of his/her progress toward tenure.
- c. All recommendations will also be conveyed in writing and delivered electronically to the faculty member.
- d. In case of denial of tenure or decision not to reappoint, the faculty member must be informed in writing, and if the faculty member so requests should be advised of the reason(s) which caused or contributed to that decision.

4. Tenure-track First Year Review:

- a. The SMED department chair will review all relevant documentation for first-year faculty, including SENTF, CV, course syllabi, and student and peer evaluations; meet with the candidate to discuss the review; and make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment.
- b. Should the Chair's recommendation be for non-reappointment, the Department PTR committee will convene to review the relevant documentation and vote in accordance with standard PTR procedure.
- c. While this new policy is not included in the current ART Document, this revised review process is a permanent change and will be the standard procedure moving forward, recorded in the ART Document that is currently being revised.

5. Tenure-Track Reappointment

- a. **Reappointment for Second-Year Faculty:** Decisions for reappointment for second-year, tenure-track faculty will follow the TU ART document, Appendix 3, Section III.D.3
- b. **Reappointment for Third- Through Fifth-year Faculty:** Decisions for reappointment for second-year, tenure-track faculty will follow the TU ART document, Appendix 3, Section III.D.4

6. Third-Year Review

- a. The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education follows the Third-Year Review procedures and chronology established by the TU ART document.
- b. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the Department PTR Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates.
- c. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This process also includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.

- d. Department PTR Committee evaluations of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the Department level and shared with the Dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the College PTR Committee or the Provost.
 - e. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim electronic evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the Department's PTR Committee as outlined in the section Appendix 3, section I.B, "Documentation and Material Inclusion," of the TU ART document. Within the *Supplementary Materials* section, the faculty member will compile documentation as outlined in section II.A of this document.
 - f. The SMED 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 must:
 - i. Include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
 - ii. Provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.
 - g. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting Department standards in service.
 - Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the Department. This ranking indicates that the Department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are needed.
 - Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.
 - h. All documentation is due to the SMED Chair of the Department by the third Friday in January.
 - i. Feedback should be both in writing delivered electronically and in a face-to-face meeting with the SMED Department Chair and the PTR Committee Chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the Dean.
7. **Comprehensive 5-year Review:** The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education follows the Comprehensive Five-Year Review procedures and chronology established by the University:
- a. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.
 - b. The Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of the College, shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the Department. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an intention to

- retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the Dean of the College.
- c. The faculty member to be reviewed will use the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost. The faculty member will compile the portfolio in compliance with the TU ART Policy (see Appendix 3, sections I.B.9 and I.B.10). Within the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost, in the *Supplementary Materials* section, the faculty member will compile documentation as outline in section II.A of this document.
 - d. The Department PTR Committee shall review the portfolio and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the Department's standards and expectations (stipulated in the Department PTR document) and submitted to the Department Chair by the second Friday in October.
 - e. The Department Chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's electronic portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.
 - f. The faculty member's electronic evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Department PTR Committee, the written evaluation of the Department Chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the Department PTR Committee Chair to the Dean's office by the second Friday in November.
 - g. The Dean of the College shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review by the first Friday in February. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.
 - h. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section.
 - i. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing and delivered electronically to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by electronic File Delivery Service (FDS).
 - j. 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 of the Department 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 of the Department, and Dean.
 - k. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction or termination
 - l. Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.

- m. Department chairpersons, as faculty members, are included in the comprehensive review process.
- n. Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their “home” Department.

III. **Department Merit Policy for All Full-Time Faculty**

- A. **Merit Policy:** All merit procedures will follow the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website:
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>
 - B. **Annual Evaluation Portfolios:** Faculty will use the digital portfolio set up by the SMED Department Chair to submit their evaluation documentation for the year under review to be evaluated by the department chair.
 - C. **Relationship between Standards for Promotion/Reappointment/Tenure and Merit:** The Department's standards for promotion apply to faculty members' teaching, scholarship, and service over a number of years while the standards for merit review apply to faculty members' performances in these areas for one year, as described AR and previous year's AWP.
 - D. **Department Standards for Merit: Based on** merit procedures following the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22, the SMED Department Chairperson will determine No Merit or Merit based on the following criteria:
 - **No Merit:** Faculty whose work *does not meet* department standards and expectations in light of the previous year's AWP document, materials presented in annual evaluation portfolio, and performance reported in the AR document in *one or more* categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
 - **Merit:** Faculty whose work *does* meet department standards and expectations in light of the previous year's AWP document, materials presented in annual evaluation portfolio, and performance reported in the AR document in *all* categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
1. **Teaching:** Judgments of *meeting department standards* in teaching will be made, using a holistic review of the faculty member's teaching activities, considering the previous year's AWP document, materials presented in annual evaluation portfolio, and performance reported in the AR document. Areas of teaching to be considered will include following are:
 - a. Peer evaluations (if applicable that academic year);
 - b. Student evaluations of teaching (quantitative and qualitative responses);
 - c. Review of syllabi and other instructional materials;
 - d. Student evaluations of advising (if applicable that academic year);
 - e. Grade distributions for each course taught;
 - f. New instructional procedures reported on AR and documented in portfolio;
 - g. Substantive curriculum and instructional revision (particularly if aligned to research, national accreditation, or larger programmatic efforts);
 - h. Leadership in department or program-specific areas of teaching and instruction;
 - i. Mentoring colleagues in effective teaching and academic advising; and
 - j. The faculty member's correlation statement/self-reflection for teaching reported on AR in reference to goals established in previous year's AWP.
 2. **Scholarship:** Judgments of *meeting department standards* in scholarship will be made, using a holistic review of the faculty member's scholarship activities, considering the previous year's AWP document, materials presented in annual evaluation portfolio, and performance reported in the AR document. Areas of scholarship to be considered will include following:

- a. Submitted, accepted, and/or published a peer reviewed article, chapter, or book for publication;
 - b. Submitted, accepted and/or published an editor reviewed article, chapter, or book for publication;
 - c. Submitted, accepted and/or presented a workshop, thematic session, or research paper at an international or national conference (i.e., proposal was accepted by, or invitation was issued from, the conference organization);
 - d. Submitted a proposal for a grant or award to an external/internal agency;
 - e. Received a grant or award from an external/internal agency;
 - f. Collected and analyzed data for a future presentation/paper;
 - g. Studied an area new to the faculty member and needed by a SMED, COE, or University program;
 - h. Supported student scholarship;
 - i. Received recognition of high distinction of a professional nature (for teaching—which demonstrated outstanding scholarship--or for scholarship alone);
 - j. Mentored junior faculty in scholarship;
 - k. Authored or played a major role in the development of a Department, College, or University document (e.g. program evaluation, accreditation document, PTR document, white paper);
 - l. Played a major role in developing or revising a program for the University, College, or Department;
 - m. Other (Evidence of advanced performance in scholarship)—as approved by the SMED Department Chairperson.
3. **Service:** Judgments of *meeting department standards* in service will be made, using a holistic review of the faculty member's service activities, considering the previous year's AWP document, materials presented in annual evaluation portfolio, and performance reported in the AR document. Areas of service to be considered will include following:
- a. Served actively on Departmental, College, University or community Committees or advisory groups that advance the mission of Towson University;
 - b. Chaired or directed an active Committee, advisory group, or program (not part of assigned time) that advance the mission of Towson University;
 - c. Served effectively as faculty advisor for a student group;
 - d. Engaged students in a significant service-learning project;
 - e. Elected as an executive/officer of a professional organization directly related to one's areas of expertise;
 - f. Served as editor and/or reviewer of scholarship for agency in faculty candidates' discipline
 - g. Received recognition of high distinction for service;
 - h. Mentored junior faculty in service;
 - i. Volunteered to perform tasks, as requested by the Chair or Departmental Committee, needed to improve or continue the Departmental programs;
 - j. Other (evidence of advanced performance in service)
- E. **Faculty on leave:** Faculty on leave in the year under evaluation will, unless the faculty states in writing a desire to be evaluated as if the faculty were not on leave, receive a Satisfactory rating without formal evaluation for the work of that year.

IV. **Lecturers**

- A. **Standards and Expectations:** Full-time lecturers are to be guided by the same faculty standards and expectations (pp. 1-2) as tenure-track and tenured faculty.
- B. **Lecturer Merit:** All merit procedures will follow the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website:
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>
- C. **Annual Evaluation Portfolio:** Lecturers will use the digital portfolio set up by the SMED Department Chair to submit their evaluation documentation for the year under review to be evaluated by the department chair.
- D. **Student Evaluation of Teaching:** Tenured and non-tenured faculty will be evaluated by all students in all the courses taught. All faculty will use and submit only the approved University and Departmental student evaluation form. These evaluation forms are sent on-line by the University through the Towson University Office of Assessment. The quantitative and qualitative data are collected by the University through Student Voice and tabulated by the Office of Assessment. The evaluation summaries are sent to the SMED Department Chair and to the faculty member via e-mail from the Assessment Analyst in the Towson University Office of Assessment. All data will be included in the faculty member's annual dossier in the "Teaching" section.
- E. **Peer Observations:**
 1. Lecturers will be observed during their second semester of full-time employment by two members of the SMED department selected by the Chair of the SMED PTR Committee in consultation with the Chair of the Department.
 2. Subsequent peer observations will occur once every three years but may occur more often if determined by the Department Chair and/or the PTR Committee.
 - a. Arrangements for observations will be made through the Departmental PTR Chair. Decisions concerning the identification of observers and times for observations will be made by the Departmental PTR Chair in collegial consultation with the faculty member to be observed and the Department Chair. At least one-week advance notice of the observation will be given to the faculty member and observers.
 - b. The faculty member should send observers a lesson plan for the lesson at least 24 hours in advance.
 - c. The observers must write an observation report/letter and submit electronically it to the faculty member observed. This report/letter will include:
 - i. An objective description of the lesson activities;
 - ii. A reaction statement which evaluates:
 - iii. Instructional strategies employed, including the instructor serving as a "facilitator of active learning" and modeling best practices;
 - iv. Objectives set and accomplished;
 - v. Professional demeanor of the faculty member;

- vi. other (optional).
 - d. A post-observation conference will take place among the faculty member and the two observers within two weeks of the observation. Both observers' observation signed reports will be presented in writing and delivered electronically to the faculty member within four weeks of the observation. The faculty member should receive, read, and sign all materials at that time. The faculty member will have two weeks to attach additional or alternative relevant information to these reports.
 - e. Should the Departmental Rank Committee wish to schedule additional visits, the faculty member will be informed in writing of the Committee's intentions and the time and place at least a week before the scheduled visit. The faculty member's input should be solicited when scheduling the observations.
 - f. Individual faculty members may request additional visitations from one or more of their Rank Committee members.
- F. Promotion to Lecturer II:** The SMED PTR Committee will follow procedures established by the [TU 02-01.05 – Policy on the Appointment, Rank and Promotion of Lecturers.](#)
- 1. Lecturer II status may be granted to lecturers to meet the following criteria:
 - a. record of at least six years teaching full-time at an accredited university.
 - b. documentation of teaching excellence across the evaluation period (e.g., peer evaluations, student feedback, and reflections on teaching)
 - c. sustained record of scholarship activities (e.g., presenting, attending conferences and other professional development) with workload identified in Annual Plans (5-15%)
 - d. sustained record of service activities commensurate with workload identified in Annual Plans (5-15%)
 - 2. In order to be considered, the following materials shall be submitted to the chairperson by the 3rd Friday in June: curriculum vita, annual plans, annual reviews, documentation of teaching excellence across the evaluation period.
 - 3. Department chairperson and PTR Committee make their recommendations to the Dean by the second Friday in November.
 - 4. Dean's negative decision can be appealed to the Provost.
 - 5. Rebuttal materials may be added to the portfolio within 10 business days of receipt of negative recommendation. Decision of the Provost is final.
- G. Promotion to Lecturer III:** The SMED PTR Committee will follow procedures established by the [TU 02-01.05 – Policy on the Appointment, Rank and Promotion of Lecturers.](#)
- 1. Lecturer III status may be granted to lecturers who meet the following criteria:
 - a. record of at least ten years teaching full-time at an accredited university
 - b. documentation of teaching excellence across the evaluation period (e.g., peer evaluations, student feedback, and reflections on teaching)

- c. sustained record of scholarship activities (e.g., presenting, attending conferences and other professional development) with workload identified in Annual Plans (5-15%)
 - d. sustained record of service activities commensurate with workload identified in Annual Plans (5-15%)
2. In order to be considered, the following materials shall be submitted to the chairperson by the 3rd Friday in June: curriculum vita, annual plans, annual reviews, documentation of teaching excellence across the evaluation period.
 3. Department chairperson and PTR Committee make their recommendations to the Dean by the second Friday in November. Dean's negative decision can be appealed to the Provost. Rebuttal materials may be added to the portfolio within 10 business days of receipt of negative recommendation

- V. **Negative Recommendations and Appeal Procedures:** The Department of Secondary and Middle School Education follows the recommendations and procedures established by the University:

A. Negative Recommendations Negative recommendations at any level regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent via File Delivery Service (FDS) by the administrator at the appropriate level. The SMED Department Chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the Departmental level, and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the College level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or via File Delivery Service (FDS) by the administrator at the appropriate level no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTRM calendar.

B. Appeal Procedures

1. All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.
2. There are three (3) types of appeals.
 - a. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either Department and/or College PTR Committees, the Department Chairperson, the Dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
 - i. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be via File Delivery Service (FDS) or in person to the College PTR, Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.
 - ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.
 - iii. Appeals of Departmental recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chair and the Department PTR Chair. Appeals of College recommendations shall be copied to the College Dean and the College PTR Committee.
 - iv. All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of

- evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTR Committee Chair.
- v. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the College PTR Committee, the University PTRM Committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - vi. Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.
- b. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
- i. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM Committee.
 - ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective Dean, Provost, or UPTRM Chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.
 - iii. Appeals of Department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chair, the Department PTR Chair, the Dean and the University PTRM Committee Chair. Appeals of College recommendations shall be copied to the College Dean, the College PTR Committee, the Department Chair, and the University PTRM Committee Chair. Appeals of Provost recommendations shall be copied to the Dean and Department Chair.
 - iv. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the University PTRM Committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - v. Recommendations of the University PTRM Committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The Chair of the University PTRM Committee will monitor the appeal process.
- c. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.
3. The President's decision on reappointment, tenure, promotion and comprehensive five-year review shall be final. The Provost's decision on merit shall be final.

VI. **Approval of this “Secondary and Middle School Education Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, Comprehensive Review, and Merit Procedures” document**

- A. **Vote on Approval of Document:** This PTRM document may be amended at any time, but will be reviewed and revised as necessary, every three years. A simple majority of the votes cast by confidential ballot will constitute agreement. This vote will occur through a confidential, secure electronic vote system. Faculty members will provide their Towson IDs for this vote. In the case of a tie vote, the committee will continue deliberations and vote again until a majority decision is reached. Changes will be submitted to the College of Education PTR Committee and the Dean for approval before going to the University PTRM Committee for approval.

VII. Calendar

The first Friday in May	Department and college PTR Committees are formed (elections for membership on the college Committee are already completed)
May 31st	<p>All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio/annual dossier to the department Chair.</p> <p>All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chair and dean of the written professional development plan.</p>
Third Friday in June	<p>For action-year reviews, including tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to full professor, and five-year reviews, faculty will use the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost. The faculty member will compile the portfolio in compliance with the TU ART Policy (see Appendix 3, sections I.B.9 and I.B.10) Within the electronic portfolio set up in SharePoint by OTS/Office of the Provost, in the <i>Supplementary Materials</i> section, the faculty member will compile documentation of the following, organized in main three sub-folders for <i>Scholarship, Teaching, and Service</i>, as outlined in section II.A of this document.</p> <p>In action review years, if your rank committee consists of less than three people, then follow procedures for procuring a non-departmental PTR member (p.10).</p>
First Business Day in July 1	<p>For faculty – chair sends the dean, and copies the faculty member, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons as outlined in the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website:</p> <p>https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html</p>
August 1 (USM mandated)	Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.
The First Friday in September	Department Chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the department tenure and/or promotion Committee (if necessary.)

The Second Friday in September	<p>University PTRM Committee shall meet and elect a Chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee's Member-at-large of the Committee members and Chairperson for the academic year.</p> <p>For faculty, to appeal the chairperson's no merit decision, the faculty member will provide a written rebuttal of the chairperson's decision to the departmental PTR Committee, along with the Merit Evaluation form including the chairperson's rationale, copying the chairperson. Policies are outlined in the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website: https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html</p>
The Third Friday in September	<p>Faculty notify department Chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.</p> <p>College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTR Committee (if necessary).</p> <p>Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before May 31st unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 3-35.D.</p> <p>First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department Chairperson.</p>
The Fourth Friday in September	<p>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.</p> <p>For faculty appealing the department chairperson's decision of no merit: The departmental PTR Committee will render a written decision to the dean, copying the faculty member and the chairperson.</p>
The Second Friday in October	<p>Department PTR Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department Chairperson.</p> <p>College PTRM documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.</p>

	<p>For faculty member's appeal to the department chairperson's decision of no merit: (i) The dean will review the materials submitted by the faculty member, the chairperson, and the department PTR committee; (ii) The dean will notify the faculty member, the PTR committee chair, and the department chairperson of their decision. (iii) Positive decisions by the dean should also be reported to the Provost Budget Office (PBO) and will result in retroactive payment to the faculty member. Policies are outlined in the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website:</p> <p>https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html</p>
The Fourth Friday in October	<p>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.</p> <p>The department Chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.</p> <p>The department PTR Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.</p> <p>For appeals to decisions of no merit: (i) In the event of a negative decision by the faculty member, the chairperson, and the department PTR committee. (ii) The faculty member, dean, chairperson and the PBO will be notified of the Provost's decision. (iii) Positive decisions by the Provost will result in retroactive payment. (iv) The Provost's decision shall be final. Policies are outlined in the updated merit policy passed by the Academic Senate on 4/4/22. This policy can be found on the University PTRM Committee website:</p> <p>https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html</p>
The Second Friday in November	<p>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.</p>
November 30th	<p>All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or electronic File Delivery Service (FDS) to the faculty member.</p>
The First Friday in December	Department PTR documents are delivered to the college PTR Committee if any changes have been made.
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	The college PTRM Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.
The Third Friday in January	<p>The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.</p> <p>The college PTRM Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.</p> <p>The department PTRM Committee and Chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.</p> <p>All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department Chairperson.</p>
The First Friday in February	<p>The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the Committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.</p> <p>The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.</p>
The Second Friday in February	The dean will, following their review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department chair's recommendation, the dean shall add their recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation

	<p>portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or electronic File Delivery Service (FDS).</p> <p>Department documents concerning promotion, tenure, and reappointment (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the University PTRM Committee.</p> <p>Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.</p>
March 1	First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the University President.
First Friday in March	Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.
Third Friday in March	Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTR Committee Chairpersons, department Chairperson, and dean of the college.

Appendix A:
Sample activities and products embedded within scholarship
(Taken from the COE PTRM document—2011)

Form of Scholarship	Sample Activities	Sample Products
<u>Scholarship of Application:</u> applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School consulting • State/LEA consulting • Applied research in University settings • Applied research in school settings. • Training/Consulting collaboratively with the community, a cluster of schools, a school system, a University/college, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to Committees or groups • Workshops for schools and community groups • Accreditation report • New program development • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Materials developed in support of MSDE Committee work (new courses, standards, etc.) • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Evaluation of a University/college, school system program or grant including scholarship of another individual's work.
<u>Scholarship of Discovery:</u> traditional research, including knowledge for its own sake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic research • Evaluation research • Review, critique, or synthesis of existing research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants and contracts awarded • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Presentations at conferences
<u>Scholarship of Integration:</u> applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-disciplinary/ cross-department research/study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of book • Publication of a chapter in a book • Publication of articles in refereed journals (print or on-line) • Publication in non-refereed journals (print or on-line) • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries
<u>Scholarship of Teaching:</u> exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher research of one's own teaching and student learning • Writing an accreditation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials/Publications designed to reach an audience of practitioners, parents, students, or other members of the community • New program development • Publication of book, a chapter in a book, article in refereed journals (print or on-line), and/or material in non-refereed journals (print or on-line)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overseeing the development of new cohort groups• Designing and/or providing materials for adjunct faculty on and off campus• Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries.
--	--	--

Appendix B
PTR Committee Agreement
Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
Promotion/Tenure and Reappointment Committee

I _____, by
signing this document acknowledged that I have reviewed the pertinent files relevant to each
candidate requesting Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Review during the
_____ academic year and I agree to keep all conversations confidential.

Faculty Signature

Date

Appendix C
Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
Advising Evaluation Form

Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
Advising Evaluation Form

Name of Secondary Education Advisor: _____

How many times have you seen this advisor?

Please give your honest feedback by rating your secondary education advisor on the following:

My Secondary Education advisor:

Disagree

Agree

1. treated me in a courteous and professional manner.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
2. was open to my questions and concerns	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
3. was knowledgeable about the secondary education program.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
4. informed me about Departmental policies and procedures.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
5. was available during posted office hours.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
6. referred me to appropriate campus resources, if I needed them.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
7. is someone I would recommend to other students.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Overall Rating of my Advisor :

A

B

C

D

F

What I appreciated about my advisor was:

I recommend that my advisor:

Appendix D
TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION FORM (DSR)

Department of Secondary and Middle School Education Recommendation Form for Year: _____
 For: _____ [name of faculty member]

This form is to be completed for all tenure-track, clinical faculty, and lecturers up for promotion by each department on conclusion of its PTR process each fall. When promotion or tenure is being considered it is forwarded as part of the faculty member's file to the appropriate college promotion and tenure committee for use during its deliberations. Recommendations for reappointment and five year comprehensive reviews are forwarded directly from the department to the dean of the college.

By signing this form faculty members indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendations; their signatures do not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendations. Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendations should follow procedures found in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty.

The Department of Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee voted to recommend that you have:

→ Tenure granted

→ Tenure denied

The Department of Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee voted to recommend you for the following:

→ Lecturer II Promotion

→ Lecturer III Promotion

The Department of Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee voted to recommend you for the following:

→ Professor

→ No Promotion

The Department of Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee voted to recommend that you be:

→ Reappointed

→ Not reappointed

The Department of Secondary and Middle Education PTR Committee recommends that your performance for the period covered by the Five Year Comprehensive Review be judged:

→ Satisfactory

→ Less than Satisfactory

Committee Chair Signature _____ Date _____

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Faculty Member Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix E
Towson University
Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
DEPARTMENT TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

Based on Evaluation of Activities for Academic Years

June 1, 20 _____ to May 31, 20 _____

Faculty member being evaluated _____

Review for: Rank _____ Tenure _____

Department of Secondary and Middle School Education

Faculty member casting this ballot: ID# _____

Date _____

Indicate “yes” or “no” for each of tenure and/or promotion

	YES	NO
Promotion		
Tenure		

This is a secret ballot as directed by the *Towson University*
Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty

(Appendix 3: III.A.5)

Appendix F
ANNUAL REPORT (AR)
 Reporting On Activities for Academic Year
 June 1, 20__ May 31, 20__

Name __ Rank __

Department of _____

Area of Specialization _____

Appointed to TU faculty: at rank __ in year ____ .

Promotion History:

To rank _____ in year ____ ,
 To rank _____ in year ____ , and
 To rank _____ in year ____ .

I. Formal Degrees

A. Highest degree earned, with date and name of granting institution. If received since June 1, 20__, attach proof.

B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1, 20__ and present status. Corroborative material and/or transcript must be attached.

II. Teaching and Advising (percentage of workload: __ %)

A. 1. Assure that all course evaluations and course syllabi are added to the appropriate Merit portfolio folder.

The course evaluation reports from the Office of Assessment will each include the course title and number, credit hours, number of students enrolled/responding, and response data for each item (median, mean, standard deviation, N).

2. Provide a brief (1-4 paragraphs) descriptive reflection on your teaching practice this past year. Highlight interpretations of data you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student feedback) to inform and guide your future teaching practices. Potential items may include (but are not limited to) levels of satisfaction with course assignments and work manageability, students' take-aways and/or gaps in understanding, grading and providing feedback, DEIJ considerations, digital accessibility, opportunities to fold in new concepts and perspectives into coursework, or other pedagogical innovations.

- 1 B. Nonclassroom assignments which are part of your regular onload teaching assignment (i.e.,
2 coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers).
3
4
- 5 C. New instructional strategies which you have introduced this year (e.g., special projects, new courses
6 and/or materials).
7
8
9
- 10 D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students).
11 Optional: Provide a descriptive reflection on your student advising practice this past year. Highlight
12 interpretations of advising efforts that you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student
13 feedback) to inform and guide your future advising practices
- 14 III. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (percentage of workload: ____ %)
15 [Attach corroborative material where appropriate]
16
17
18

19 Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for the academic year, please
20 explain.
21
22
23
24

- 25 IV. Service (percentage of workload: ____ %)
26 [Indicate any of these activities which are part of your workload]
27
28

29 Department:
30
31

32 College:
33
34

35 University:
36
37

38 Community:
39
40

41 Profession:
42
43

44 Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for the academic year, please
45 explain.
46

Appendix G
ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN (AWP)

Agreement On Faculty Expectations For Academic Year

June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

Teaching and Advising (percentage of workload: %)

I. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the academic year.

A. Non-classroom assignments which will be part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers) for the academic year.

B. New instructional strategies which you plan to introduce this year (e.g., special projects, new courses and/or materials). Also include interdisciplinary, diversity, international, and new technology projects, if appropriate.

C. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

II. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (percentage of workload: %)

III. Service (percentage of workload: %)

[For any of these activities which are part of your workload, please indicate.]

Department:

College:

University:

Community:

Profession:

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member/Date

Chairperson of Department/Date

Dean of College

Appendix H

CHAIRPERSON'S ANNUAL REPORT (CAR)

Reporting On Activities For Academic Year

June 1, 20__ May 31, 20__

Name _____ Rank _____

Department of _____

Area of Specialization _____

Appointed to TU faculty: at rank _____ in year _____

Promotion History:

To rank _____ in year _____,

To rank _____ in year _____, and

To rank _____ in year _____,

I. Formal Degrees

A. Highest degree earned, with date and name of granting institution. If received since June 1, 20__, attach proof.

B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1, 20__ and present status. Corroborative material and/or transcript must be attached.

II. Leadership Report (See Roles, Responsibilities and Core Functions of Academic Chairperson) (percentage of workload: ____%)

III. Teaching and Advising (percentage of workload: ____%)

A.

1. Assure that all course evaluations and course syllabi are added to the appropriate Merit portfolio folder.

1. The course evaluation reports from the Office of Assessment will each

include the course title and number, credit hours, number of students enrolled/responding, and response data for each item (median, mean, standard deviation, N).

- B. Provide a brief (1-4 paragraphs), descriptive reflection on your teaching practice this past year. Highlight interpretations of data you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student feedback) to inform and guide your future teaching practices. Potential items may include (but are not limited to) levels of satisfaction with course assignments and work manageability, students' take-aways and/or gaps in understanding, grading and providing feedback, DEIJ considerations, digital accessibility, opportunities to fold in new concepts and perspectives into coursework, or other pedagogical innovations.

List all other teaching roles as outlined in the Chairperson Roles document.

- C. New instructional strategies, which you have introduced this year (e.g., special projects, new courses and/or materials).
- D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, Interdisciplinary students).

Optional: Provide a descriptive reflection on your student advising practice this past year. Highlight interpretations of advising efforts that you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student feedback) to inform and guide your future advising practices.

- IV. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (percentage of workload: ____%)
(Attach corroborative material where appropriate)
Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year, please explain

- V. Service (See Roles, Responsibilities and Core Functions of Academic Chairperson)
(percentage of workload: ____%)

Department:

College:

University:

Community:

Profession:

Correlation Statement.