

**Department of Special Education
Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR) Document**

Departmental Approval 05.31.11

College Approval 06.20.11

University Approval 07.28.11

Departmental Revisions 12.03.12

College Approval of Revisions 12.03.12

Departmental Approval of Revisions 05.22.14

College Approval of Revisions 07.09.14

Department Revisions 11.01.23

Department Revisions 04.24.24

This document will be reviewed and revised as needed.

Table of Contents

I. STANDARDS.....	4
A. STANDARDS FOR ALL DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FACULTY	4
B. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT (PTR)	4
II. STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	9
A. OVERVIEW OF ANNUAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT.....	9
B. DOCUMENTATION AND MATERIAL: THE EVALUATION PORTFOLIO.....	9
III. TIMELINE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	11
IV. PROCESS FOR MERIT REVIEW:	12
A. FULL-TIME FACULTY MERIT PROCESS AND TIMELINE OF MERIT EVALUATION	12
B. DOCUMENTATION AND MATERIAL INCLUSION.....	13
C. MERIT RATING SYSTEM	14
D. NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPEALS.....	15
V. GENERAL PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	17
A. TENURE PROCESS PROCEDURES	17
B. TIMELINE FOR PROMOTION	19
C. DOCUMENTATION: MATERIALS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO	20
D. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES	22
E. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION.....	22
F. NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPEALS	23
G. ONGOING PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	25
VI. GUIDELINES FOR FIRST YEAR FACULTY	28
A. FIRST YEAR FACULTY PROCESS.....	28
B. TIMELINE FOR FIRST YEAR REVIEW	28
C. DOCUMENTATION AND MATERIALS INCLUSION	29
D. REAPPOINTMENT: FIRST YEAR FACULTY	29
E. APPEALS.....	30
VII. REAPPOINTMENT OF SECOND YEAR FACULTY	31
A. SECOND YEAR FACULTY PROCESSES	31
B. TIMELINE FOR SECOND YEAR REVIEW	31
C. APPEALS.....	32
VIII. REAPPOINTMENT OF THIRD THROUGH FIFTH YEAR FACULTY.....	33
A. REAPPOINTMENT NOTES:	33
B. TIMELINE FOR THIRD THROUGH FIFTH YEAR REVIEW	33
C. PROCEDURES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW.....	34
D. DOCUMENTATION & MATERIALS INCLUSION FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW	35
E. PROCEDURES FOR FIVE-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.....	36
IX. PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS	39
A. PRINCIPLES	39
B. DOCUMENTATION DEVELOPMENT.....	39
C. DOCUMENT STORAGE	40
D. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.....	40

X. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE STRUCTURE, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES.....	42
A. NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS	42
B. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT RELATIVE TO PTR PROCESS	43
APPENDICES	45
APPENDIX A	45
APPENDIX B.....	46
APPENDIX C.....	50
APPENDIX D	51
APPENDIX E.....	52

Department of Special Education Promotion and Tenure Document

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

I. Standards

A. Standards for all Department of Special Education Faculty

Department Expectations:

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

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

B. Standards for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR)

Areas of Review:

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

1. Teaching: Teaching is the primary mission of Towson University and the primary responsibility of each faculty member. Faculty members are expected to model exemplary teaching practices and should be rated as excellent in this area. As described in *Appendix 3* to the *Towson University Policy on Appointment Rank and Tenure of Faculty*, teaching performance will be evaluated from the following evidence submitted by the candidate:
 - a. Peer evaluations of all faculty with a minimum of two observations per review period. For tenure-track faculty, 'review period' is defined as one Timeline year; for tenured faculty, the 'review period' is defined as five Timeline years. The departmental PTR committee must approve each peer review. Peer evaluations shall use the suggested criteria found in Appendix A to report the findings.
 - b. Student course evaluations of teaching (both quantitative and qualitative) from the TU evaluation system.

- c. Self-evaluation of teaching and/or advising effectiveness in a narrative statement that discusses the faculty member's teaching/advising philosophy as well as an interpretation of student/peer/chairperson's evaluations.
 - d. Review of syllabi and other related course materials.
- 1.1 Advising: Academic advising is another component of excellence in the overall category of teaching. While the process of advising differs between undergraduate and graduate programs all advisors are expected to:
- a. Be accessible to assist students with academic questions;
 - b. Be knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures;
 - c. Provide accurate and timely information to students; and,
 - d. Be professional in relating to students;
 - e. Assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their professional goals;
 - f. Provide assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action;

Other forms of advising may include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class- teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, and serving on a graduate research committee. (See Appendix B for Advising Evaluation form).

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

Utilizing UniSCOPE (2000) as a guiding framework scholarship can be defined as: "The thoughtful discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge ... informed by current knowledge in the field and [is] characterized by creativity and openness to new information, debate, and criticism. For scholarly activity to be recognized, utilized, and rewarded, it must be shared with others in appropriate ways." (p. 2)

Articulated within Appendix 3 the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (ART Policy) are four forms of scholarship that guide our work in the Department of Special Education (Table 1). Further elaboration on the four Forms of Scholarship can be found in the College of Education P&T document.

Table 1: Four Forms of Scholarship

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

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

Table 2: Sample activities and products embedded within scholarship.

Form of Scholarship	Sample Activities	Sample Products
<p>Scholarship of Application:</p> <p>Applying knowledge to consequential problems be they internal or external to the university</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School consulting • State/LEA consulting • Applied research in university settings • Applied research in school settings, including Professional Development Schools (PDS) • Training/Consulting collaboratively with the community, a cluster of schools, a school system, a university/college, etc. 	<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.
<p>Scholarship of Discovery:</p> <p>Traditional research, including knowledge for its own sake</p>	<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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants, grant reports, and executive summaries. • Presentations at conferences
<p>Scholarship of Integration:</p> <p>Applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines</p>	<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
<p>Scholarship of Teaching:</p> <p>Exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning</p>	<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) • 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.

3. Service: Faculty members are responsible for service to the University (which includes the college and department), their discipline, and the broader community including collaborations and partnerships with practitioners in the field. Service may also include civic service 'that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the University's mission' (ART Document, p. 14). It is expected that Department of Special Education faculty demonstrate their commitment to service as documented by activities such as:
 - a. Membership on department, college, and university committees and 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 Development Schools;
 - e. Involvement in professional organizations and associations in one's field at the state, regional, national, or international level; and,
 - f. Service to community associations.

II. Standards for Annual Review and Reappointment Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

A. Overview of Annual Review and Reappointment

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

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

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

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

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

B. Documentation and Material: The Evaluation Portfolio

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

Guided by the chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as they deem appropriate in narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

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

1. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in the UPTR SharePoint site, created, and managed by OTS, or shared electronic repository as specified by the PTR, as an electronic portfolio.
2. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - a. completed and signed Annual Report and Annual Workload Plan (AR and AWR).

- b. current Curriculum vitae;
- c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - i. student evaluations;
 - ii. grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- e. documentation of scholarship and service.
- f. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

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

A. Deadlines.

1. The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an electronic evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

2. The Third Friday in September

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

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

3. The Second Friday in October

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

4. The Fourth Friday in October

The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

5. The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the Dean's office.

6. November 30

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

IV. Process for Merit Review:

A. Full-time Faculty Merit Process and Timeline of Merit Evaluation

Note: The process for merit recommendations is not related to procedures and policies pertaining to decisions of reappointment, tenure, promotion, or five-year review. Faculty/chairpersons undergoing review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or five-year review will submit separate dossiers relevant to those reviews by the deadlines articulated in the ART document. As such, the decision of merit from this process may differ from those made through the ART process. The merit process applies to all full-time faculty which includes tenure/tenure track faculty, lecturers, clinical faculty, and professors of practice.

1. **Due May 31st** (In the event that May 31st falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline shall be the first business day).
 - Full-time faculty submit their dossier for the year under review to the department chair.
 - Chairs submit their dossier for the year under review to their Dean.
 - The Annual Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and Chairpersons shall be used as the instrument to evaluate for merit decision.
 - Faculty/chairpersons must receive “Meets Expectations” in all categories to receive a decision of merit.
 - Faculty/chairpersons on sabbatical, FMLA, or other leave during the year under review will only be rated on categories relevant to their duties as agreed upon in their Annual Workload Plan for the year under review.
2. **First Business Day in July**
 - For faculty – chair sends the Dean, and copies the faculty member, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons
 - For chairpersons – Dean sends the Provost, and copies the chairperson, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons to the chairperson
 - Any negative decision must be accompanied by a written rationale in the comments section of the evaluation form or as an attachment.
 - Faculty/chairpersons may appeal a decision of no merit.
3. **Second Friday in September**
 - 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.
 - A decision of no merit for faculty by the chairperson shall be reviewed by the departmental PTR committee only if a rebuttal by the faculty member is filed.
 - In the case of a rebuttal, the PTR chair should notify the department chairperson who may provide additional written comments regarding the negative decision. The PTR chair should inform the department chairperson of the committee’s review timeline so the chairperson’s additional written comments will be received in advance of the committee’s review.
 - Any deliberations by the departmental PTR Committee shall exclude participation by the faculty member under consideration and the department chairperson.

- For chairpersons - Chairperson may provide a written rebuttal to the Dean's decision to the Provost, with a copy to the Dean.

4. **Fourth Friday in September**

- For faculty - The departmental PTR Committee will render a written decision to the Dean, copying the faculty member and the chairperson.

5. **Second Friday in October**

- For faculty - The Dean will review the materials submitted by the faculty member, the chairperson, and the department PTR committee.
- The Dean will notify the faculty member, the PTR committee chair, and the department chairperson of their decision.
- 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.

6. **Fourth Friday in October**

- For faculty - In the event of a negative decision by the faculty member, the chairperson, and the department PTR committee.
- The faculty member, Dean, chairperson and the PBO will be notified of the Provost's decision.
- Positive decisions by the Provost will result in retroactive payment.
- The Provost's decision shall be final.
- For chairpersons - In the event of a negative decision by the Dean, the Provost will review the materials submitted by the Dean and the chairperson.
- The Dean, chairperson and the PBO will be notified of the Provost's decision.
- Positive decisions by the Provost will result in retroactive payment.
- The Provost's decision shall be final.

Records Retention: Confidential copies of all the above materials are retained by the department in accordance University Records Management Policy 06-06 (Updated 12.21.2022).

B. Documentation and Material Inclusion

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

Guided by the Departmental Chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

To ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for merit contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an electronic evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's Department and College criteria.

Materials to be included in faculty/chairperson dossier:

1. Annual Workload Plan (AWP) or Chairs Annual Workload Plan
2. Annual Report or Chairs Annual Report (for the year under review)
3. Updated CV
4. Syllabi of courses taught during the year
5. All available student evaluations for the period under review
6. Any peer observations received during the review period

During the evaluation process, the faculty member or their chairperson participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review,

Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Timeline (Section VI of the Electronic Portfolio).

C. Merit Rating System

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

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

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

If the faculty member or the chairperson participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to their file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled - Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30. The Dean will send a copy to the Department chairperson of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

If the Department Chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other than their evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but will be forwarded under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR) Document Review Transmittal Form (see Section VII). A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

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

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

D. Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations: Recommendations at any level regarding merit shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS) by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Department Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS), return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTR Timeline.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) Timeline days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified electronic mail sent through the university File Delivery Service (FDS).

There are three (3) types of appeals: substantive, procedural and those alleging discrimination:

1. **Substantive appeals:** refer to perceived errors in judgment by either the Department Chairperson or the Dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS), or in person, to the Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) Timeline days of notification of the negative recommendation.

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

All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio 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 Department Chairperson.

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

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

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS) or in person to the respective Dean, Provost, or University PTR Chairperson within twenty-one (21) Timeline days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chairperson, the Dean and the University PTR committee Chairperson.

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

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

3. **Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination** in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination.

V. General Processes for Promotion and Tenure

A. Tenure Process Procedures

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

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

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

Voting Procedures:

Per the recommendations of the Office of the Provost, and following the language adopted from the UPTR website the SPED department will use TU's Involved @ TU web-based program for remote PTR voting¹. In the case that Involved @ TU web-based remote technology is no longer available, another web-based program may be used. Any remote voting technology must include the following:

1. All ballots must collect the Faculty ID number.
2. Any voting mechanism 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.

The SPED department will forego the use of the Department Summary Recommendation (DSR) and use an email acknowledgment system, if the email acknowledgment is printed and retained.

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

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

¹ Note. The language listed above is taken from the UPTR website 4/13/2023.
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/ptrm.html>

Department Chairperson files the evaluation by the fourth Friday in October.

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

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

The College P&T Committee shall consider the Evaluation Record relative to tenure and/or promotion. It shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service. The statement with recommendation and vote count shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and submitted to the Dean by the first Friday in January.

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

The recommendations of the College P&T Committee and the Dean shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the third Friday in January. Copies also shall be sent to the Department Chairperson and the Department P&T Committee Chairperson. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the Dean or sent by via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

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

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

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

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

B. Timeline for Promotion

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

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

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

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

The First Friday in September

Department Chairperson approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department P&T Committee. **Note.** The list of additional faculty are required when a department is comprised of membership with fewer than three tenured faculty (See Appendix 3, IV.C.4)

The Third Friday in September

Faculty notify Department Chairperson of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

College P&T Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's P&T Committee (if necessary).

Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1, unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a.35.

The Fourth Friday in September

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

The Second Friday in October

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

The Fourth Friday in October

Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for promotion and tenure review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

The Department Chairperson will place their independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Committee Chairperson to the Dean's office.

November 30th

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

The First Friday in January

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

The Third Friday in January

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

The College P&T Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

The First Friday in February

The college Dean forwards the electronic portfolio inclusive of the College P&T Committee's and the Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure to the Provost.

The Third Friday in March

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College P&T committee chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and Dean of the college.

C. Documentation: Materials for Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

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

Guided by the chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

Evaluation Portfolio Materials for PTR Review:

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

- Completed and signed Annual Report and Annual Workload Plan (AR & AWP);
- Current Curriculum vitae
- Syllabi of courses taught
- Evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - student evaluations
 - grade distributions for courses

- documentation of scholarship and service;
- a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on their workload agreements for the period under review.

If at any level confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

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

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

Section I

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

Section II

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Review and Annual Workload Plans (ARI & II) arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section III

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

Section IV

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

Section V

- Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);
- Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form;
- Written recommendation of the academic chairperson;
- Written recommendation of the College P&T Committee; and,
- Written recommendation of the academic Dean.

D. Additional Documentation Responsibilities

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

Supporting materials submitted within the electronic portfolio are not returned to the department, and therefore, these materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

E. Standards for Promotion

This section outlines the standards for promotion and/or advancement to tenure. Each faculty member is responsible for showcasing their best work in each area of review: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. While excellence in teaching is paramount for successful promotion and tenure review at Towson University, without evidence of scholarship and the establishment of a scholarly agenda, tenure and promotion will not be granted. Standards from promotion to Associate Professor and Professor (Table 4).

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

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

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

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

Table 4: College of Education Standards for Promotion and Tenure Advancement

	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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • Leadership in service to the university, college, and/or department. • Leadership in service to the profession.
Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a programmatic anchor(s) for their scholarship • 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"> • In addition to expectations listed for promotion to Associate: • Evidence of local, regional, national, or international expertise/reputation

F. Negative Recommendations and Appeals

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the P&T review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System to the faculty member's last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System according to the University PTR Timeline.

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 via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

There are three (3) types of appeals: substantive, procedural and those alleging discrimination:

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

The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System or in person to the College P&T, Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

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

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

All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate P&T committee Chairperson.

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

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

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

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System or in person to the respective Dean, Provost, or University PTR Chairperson within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

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

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

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

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

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

G. Ongoing Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review

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

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

1. **Peer Evaluation for Formative purposes.**

All faculty are encouraged to invite other members to observe their teaching and to provide him/her with written and/or oral comments as helpful feedback.

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

All faculty must be observed regularly.

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

- a. Non-tenured, tenure track faculty must be observed a minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per review period.
- b. Tenured faculty must be observed at least twice their five-year comprehensive review period, with one observation occurring the year before their review year.

3. **Peer Visitation**

- a. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
- b. A pre-observation conference between the faculty member and the observer will be held so that the faculty member can discuss the class session to be observed. This may include class goals, objectives, and activities.
- c. Following the class session, the observer must write a summary reaction and submit it to the instructor observed. The faculty member has the right to determine if s/he intends to have this review included in their Promotion and Tenure and/or Merit documents or have another observation. It is suggested that the summary reaction contain references to the following qualities:
 - Organization or structure of the lesson
 - Clarity of instruction

- Knowledge of content
- Relationship with students
- Professional competence
- Use of principles of Universal Design for Learning, Differentiation of Instruction, and/or Culturally Responsive Teaching as relevant/appropriate

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

Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

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

Evaluation of Advising

Advisors are expected to:

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

A sample advising evaluation form is provided in Appendix A.

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

Faculty Support

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

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

In a case in which the candidate switched their department, the following two elements shall be considered:

1. If the candidate's years of service in the current department is less than, or equal to, one year, the candidate's application shall be reviewed by the applicant's prior department.

2. Otherwise, the candidate's application will be reviewed by the current department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

VI. Guidelines for First Year Faculty

A. First Year Faculty Process

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

1. Board of Regents' and Towson University's criteria for annual review, reappointment, tenure, promotion, merit and comprehensive review considerations;
2. Standards and expectations of the university, college, and department; and,
3. Any expectations unique to the position.

B. Timeline for First Year Review [Per Flow Chart on UPRTM website]

The Third Friday in January

First year faculty submits, syllabi, and student/peer evaluations to Chair.

.

The First Friday in February

Chair makes recommendations.

If Reappointment, Chair notifies PTR Committee, Faculty, Chair, Dean, and Provost. If non-Reappointment, Chair forwards all materials to the Department PTR Committee and Dean and notifies faculty.

Third Friday in February

If reappointment, Department PTR Committee notifies Faculty, Chair, Dean and Provost. If non-Reappointment, Department PTR Committee notifies Faculty, Chair, Dean, and Provost- Provost notifies President. Faculty can begin to prepare their appeal to the President.

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

Fourth Friday in February

If Reappointment, Dean notifies Faculty, Chair, Department PTR Committee, and Provost. If non-reappointment, Dean notifies Faculty, Chair, Department PTR Committee, and Provost.

Prior to March 1st

Provost makes recommendation to President. If Reappointment, Provost notifies Faculty, Chair, Department PTR Committee, and Dean. If non-reappointment, Faculty is notified in writing by the President within 10 business days.

May 31st

First-year faculty complete the Annual workload plan (AWP) by May 31st of their first year to indicate what their projected goals (teaching, scholarship, and service) for the following year (year 2)

C. Documentation and Materials Inclusion

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

Guided by the chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as s/he deems appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

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

- Completed and signed Annual Workload Plan (AWP), formerly Annual Report Parts I & II Forms;
- Current Curriculum vitae;
- Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- Evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - Student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department Chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - Grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
- Documentation of scholarship and service.
- Peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluand.

D. Reappointment: First Year Faculty

The Department Chair shall evaluate each new faculty member's first semester performance and make a recommendation for reappointment and merit.

Each faculty member shall prepare an electronic evaluation portfolio describing activities and accomplishments during their first semester and submit this to the Department Chair for review. The evaluation portfolio must include the Standards and Expectations of New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form, updated curriculum vitae (CV), relevant course syllabi, and student and peer evaluations. Upon review of the evaluation portfolio material the Department Chair must also meet with

the candidate to discuss the review. The Chair must make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment.

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.

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

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

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean, inclusive of the Department Chairperson's recommendation and in the event of the Chair's recommendation for non-reappointment the required Department PTR committee vote count. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by certified electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS).

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

Non-reappointment recommendations will be delivered to the Provost.

E. Appeals

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

If the Provost accepts the non-reappointment recommendation, written notice shall either be delivered to the faculty member or sent by certified electronic mail through the university File Delivery Service (FDS) by March 1; otherwise, the appointment is renewed automatically for one (1) additional year.

VII. Reappointment of Second Year Faculty

A. Second Year Faculty Processes

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

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

All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's recommendation and a record of the vote count. Non-reappointment recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent by via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

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

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

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

B. Timeline for Second Year Review

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

The Third Friday in September

Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified.

The Fourth Friday in October

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

The Department Chairperson will place their independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November.

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the Dean's office.

November 30th

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

The Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service.

Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

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.

C. Appeals

A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation for reappointment at any point in the process following procedures outlined in the Appeals section of this document. An appeal shall not stay the reappointment evaluation process.

VIII. Reappointment of Third through Fifth Year Faculty

A. Reappointment Notes:

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

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

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

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

B. Timeline for Third through Fifth Year Review

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.

August 1 (USM mandated)

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

The Fourth Friday in October

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

The Department Chairperson will place their independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the Dean's office.

November 30th

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

The Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System

The First Friday in February

The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean shall prepare their own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the electronic portfolio.

C. Procedures for Third-Year Review

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

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

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

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

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

- Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
- Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This ranking indicates that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is

satisfactory, but improvements are needed.

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

All documentation is due to the Department Chairperson.

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

D. Documentation & Materials Inclusion for Third Year Review

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

Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

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

- completed Annual Review and Annual Workload Plan (AR and AWP);
- current Curriculum vitae;
- syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
- student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
- grade distributions for courses beginning with the year the department PTR document is approved;
- documentation of scholarship and service.

Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:

- all of the items listed above;
- syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;

- student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year; and,
- a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how they have met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on their workload agreements for the period under review.

E. Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Review

General information regarding University System of Maryland (USM) policy on evaluation may be found in the Board of Regents - II-1.00 University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty² and the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty³.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Documentation and Materials Inclusion for Five-Year Review

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

Guided by the Chairperson and department and college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as they deem appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

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

² University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty:
<http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II100.html>

³ Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty:
<http://inside.towson.edu/generalcampus/tupolicies/categorylist.cfm?thecategory=Faculty>

- completed and signed Annual Review and Annual Workload Plans (AR and AWP) Forms for each of the five-years under review;
- current Curriculum vitae;
- syllabi of courses taught during the five-years under review;
- evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, for the five-years under review and including the following:
 - student evaluations tabulated by the office of the Department Chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect Fall 2010;
 - peer evaluations of teaching at least for the prior academic year;
 - documentation of scholarship and service; and,
 - a reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five-years of his/ her work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

If the faculty member or the Chairperson participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to their file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled — "Information Added." All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30. The Dean will send a copy to the Department Chairperson of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.

If the Chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other than their evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure & Reappointment (PTR) Document Review Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

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

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

In addition to the annual evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for comprehensive review shall also prepare an electronic portfolio for the Provost. In each section of the electronic portfolio, documents will cover the five-years under review and shall be presented from the most-to-least recent year. The summative electronic portfolio for the Provost shall be 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 Review and Annual Workload Plans (AR and AWP).

Section III

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

Section IV

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

Section V

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

2. Additional Documentation Responsibilities

- Electronic portfolios that do not comply with this organization will be flagged, and the department will be notified.
- The Dean of the college shall assure that the electronic portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.
- Access to supporting materials will be retained by the Department Chairperson for three years thereafter. Specific access to materials will be granted if requested by the Provost.

IX. Process and Procedures for Comprehensive Reviews

A. Principles

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

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

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

All votes regarding comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by confidential remote ballot, using Involved @ TU web-based program. All ballots must include the Faculty ID number, and dated by the voting member. Votes will then be tallied by the Committee Chairperson. The Committee Chairperson shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

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

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

B. Documentation Development

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

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

For every type of evaluation, the faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that they have read, but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation. However, failure to sign shall not prevent the documentation from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.

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

All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material inclusion process has been adhered to with respect to notifying the faculty member and adhering to the review process timeline as stipulated in the Towson University Comprehensive Review Timeline.

C. Document Storage

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

The Dean shall forward the evaluation recommendation to the Provost.

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

D. Evaluation Procedures

Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

- The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
- All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.
- The Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Dean of the college shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the department. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of 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.
- Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed above.
- The Department P&T Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations and submitted to the Department Chairperson.
- The Department Chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Department committee, the written evaluation of the Department Chairperson, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the Department P&T Committee Chairperson to the Dean's office.

- The Dean shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.
- A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section.
- All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Department Chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson or sent via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.
- A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the Chairperson and the Dean.
- The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, Chairperson and Dean. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction or termination.
- Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.
- Chairpersons, as faculty members, are included in the comprehensive review process.
- Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" department.

X. Comprehensive Review Committee Structure, Policies, and Procedures

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

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

A. Negative Recommendations

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System by the administrator at the appropriate level. The Chairperson has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the Dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the University PTR Timeline.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) Timeline days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

There are three (3) types of appeals:

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

The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System or in person to the College P&T, Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

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

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

All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate P&T Committee Chairperson.

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

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

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

Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM committee.

The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System or in person to the respective Dean, Provost, or University PTRM Chairperson within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

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

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

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

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

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

B. Faculty Development Relative to PTR Process

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

Resources shall be supported university-wide through the Division of Academic Affairs and through other appropriate units, such as Faculty Academic Center for Excellence at Towson (FACET), as well as through departmental and college-based programs.

Within the second semester of the academic year, the Office of the Provost shall provide a workshop addressing PTR issues. Faculty members serving on university, college, and/or Department P&T Committees are expected to attend. Faculty members aspiring to serve on PTR committees are encouraged and welcomed to attend regardless of their rank. Such workshops may address current national trends in evaluation issues and any changes in USM and Towson University institutional policies. A certificate of attendance will be provided. Faculty may include such certificate under university service in their annual evaluation portfolio.

Appendices
Appendix A

Advising Evaluation Form: *Special Education*

Name of Advisor: _____ Date: _____

I contact my advisor in the following way/s (check those that apply):

_____ In person meetings _____ Email _____ Telephone Calls and/or phone messages

Number of times I have contacted my advisor over the past year (total of in-person, email, or phone contacts): _____

		Disagree 1	2	3	4	Agree 5
1.	My advisor is available during posted hours.					
2.	If I have a class conflict with my advisor's posted hours, my advisor works with me to see me at another time.					
3.	My advisor responds to my questions in a timely manner (usually within 48-72 hours except for holidays, weekends, or other circumstances).					
4.	My advisor treats me in a courteous and professional manner.					
5.	My advisor is knowledgeable about the Special Education program.					
6.	If my advisor did not know the answer to a specific question, he/she contacted appropriate sources to get the answer.					
7.	My advisor is a valuable resource.					

	Not Helpful 1	2	3	4	Valuable Experience 5
Overall Rating of My Advisor					

Please feel free to respond to the following (use the back of this sheet)

1. What I appreciated about my advisor....

2. I recommend that my advisor...

Appendix B

TOWSON UNIVERSITY PROMOTION, TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT TIMELINE

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

1. The First Friday in May

Department and College P&T Committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed).

2. The Third Friday in June

- i. All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.
- ii. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on Department P&T Committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and Dean.
- iii. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chairperson and Dean of the written professional development plan.

3. August 1 (USM mandated)

- i. 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.
- ii. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.

4. The First Friday in September

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

5. The Second Friday in September

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

6. The Third Friday in September

- i. Faculty notify Department Chairperson of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- ii. College P&T Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's P&T Committee (if necessary).
- iii. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 35
- iv. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the Department Chairperson.

7. The Fourth Friday in September

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

8. The Second Friday in October

- i. Department P&T Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.
- ii. College P&T documents are due to the University PTRM committee if changes have been made.

9. The Fourth Friday in October

- i. 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.
- ii. The Department Chairperson will place their independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- iii. The Department P&T Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

10. The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department P&T Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department P&T Chairperson to the Dean's office.

11. November 30th

- i. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
- ii. The Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.

12. The First Friday in December

Department P&T documents are delivered to the College P&T Committee if any changes have been made.

13. The Second Friday in December

First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the Department Chairperson.

14. 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.

15. The First Friday in January

- i. The Department P&T Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the Department Chairperson.
- ii. The College P&T Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the Dean.

16. The Third Friday in January

- i. The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- ii. The College P&T Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
- iii. The Department P&T Committee and Chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.
- iv. All documentation for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson.
- v. Department Chairperson recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

17. The First Friday in February

- i. 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.
- ii. The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean shall prepare their own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

18. The Second Friday in February

- i. The Dean will, following their review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean shall add their recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or via digital communication using the University's File Delivery System.
- ii. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the University PTRM committee.
- iii. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

19. March 1

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

20. First Friday in March

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

21. Third Friday in March

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College P&T Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and Dean of the college.

Appendix C

Department of Special Education
Review Committee Agreement

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

Faculty Signature

Date

Appendix D

Department of Special Education
Review Committee Vote Sheet

_____ is requesting

☐ Promotion

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

☐ Tenure

☐ Third Year Review

☐ Five-year Comprehensive Review

.....
☐ I Support the Request

☐ I Do Not Support the Request

Towson University ID # _____

Date: _____

Appendix E

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

P & T RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____
(Faculty Member)

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

The _____ Department P&T Committee voted to recommend that you have:
 ☐ Tenure granted
 ☐ Tenure denied

The _____ Department P&T Committee recommends you for the following:
Promotion to:
 ☐ Assistant Professor
 ☐ Associate Professor
 ☐ Professor
 ☐ No promotion

The _____ Department P&T Committee recommends that you be:
 ☐ Reappointed
 ☐ Not reappointed

Faculty Member Signature

Date