

Towson University
College of Fine Arts and Communications
Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT FOR
FULL-TIME, TENURE-TRACK, OR TENURED FACULTY
11/05/21**

Table of Contents

I. Statement Of Compliance	2
II. Revision	2
III. Purposes Of These Policies And Procedures	2
IV. Unique Profiles For Individual Faculty Members	3
V. University-Wide Expectations And Standards	3
VI. Department Expectations And Standards	3
A. General	3
B. Teaching and Advising	4
C. Scholarship and Creative Activity	7
D. Service	11
E. Appropriate Terminal Degree	13
F. Award of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	13
G. Promotion to Professor	13
VII. Materials For Faculty Evaluation	14
VIII. Department Of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education Tenure and PRM Committees	16
A. Peer-Observation Procedures	17
B. Calendar Deadlines	18
IX. MERIT	18
A. General	18
B. Criteria	19
C. Procedure	20
X. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW	20
XI. TENURE and/or PROMOTION	20
XII. COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY	21
XIII. PTRM CALENDAR	22
XIV. APPEALS	24
XV. REFERENCE SOURCES	24

Towson University
College of Fine Arts and Communications
Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT FOR
FULL-TIME, TENURE-TRACK, OR TENURED FACULTY**

I. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

All policies in this document may not contradict or conflict with those of the University of Maryland System Board of Regents, the American Association of University Professors, Towson University, and the College of Fine Arts and Communication. University policy is documented in the *Towson University Faculty Handbook*. The *University of Maryland System Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty* is found in the *Towson University Dean's/Chairperson's Handbook*.

II. REVISION

This document is subject to an annual vote of approval (by simple majority) by full-time faculty no later than the first Friday in May and remains in effect until changed by the department faculty and approved first by the College PTRM committee, then by the Dean, and finally by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit (hereafter PTRM) Committee.

III. PURPOSES OF THESE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- To exercise peer review in the measurement and evaluation of faculty performance.
- To establish standards by which faculty performance can be measured.
- To assist faculty in the continuing effort to develop excellence in teaching and professional pursuits.
- To elicit evaluative responses from colleagues and students with regard to faculty performance.
- To obtain recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit for each member of the faculty.
- To articulate faculty responsibilities.

IV. UNIQUE PROFILES FOR INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBERS

Each faculty member will be evaluated as a unique individual exhibiting a distinctive profile of accomplishment in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The profile will depend upon the nature of a faculty member's specialization within the discipline of art and personal interests, but must also reflect the department's needs and teaching responsibilities.

V. UNIVERSITY-WIDE EXPECTATION AND STANDARDS

The Towson University Faculty Handbook describes standards and expectations that faculty members in the Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education may use to develop a profile and to support requests for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. These criteria are intended to serve as a basis for determining the kinds of activity and levels of professional distinction and accomplishment that are expected for advancement through the process of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

VI. DEPARTMENT EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS

A. General

- A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of human, ethical, and professional behavior.
- A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college, and university.
- For the purposes of annual workload agreements and work review, the percentages of total effort defined by the University System of Maryland are to be applied to each faculty member. Given the nature of an art faculty member's work, the department recognizes that there are work locations beyond a faculty member's office and classroom in which a faculty member routinely does his/her work.
- Evaluative statements, in AR/CAR forms, narratives, and committee reports, should judge contributions in terms of quality. It is important to make use of standardized terms that describe faculty accomplishments accurately and uniformly. Examples of standardized terms are: good, excellent, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, is satisfactory, is not satisfactory, is local, regional, and national or international.

B. Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching and Advising

1. Teaching takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology, development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, emphasis on pedagogy, including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It also includes advising responsibilities.
2. Evaluation of teaching may take many forms and should consider classroom performance (as well as other venues for teaching) and the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching. Teaching effectiveness can best be evaluated through multiple criteria, including but not limited to:

Quantitative student evaluations;
 Summaries of written evaluations from student evaluation forms;
 Copies of signed reports from peer observations of teaching;
 Comments on teaching from department and chair letters evaluating the candidate;
 The candidate's reflective essay on his/her teaching (self-evaluation);
 Evaluation of student learning outcomes;
 Evidence of development of new courses, and/or new programs;
 Evidence of the use of appropriate technologies to improve instruction;
 Evidence of the use of contemporary theory and practice to improve instruction;
 Professional awards for teaching excellence;
 Evidence for New Instructional Procedures from the Annual Review form

With regard to the Student Evaluation Process, note that:

- A. Student evaluations are required for all courses taught, excluding internships and independent studies.
- B. Using the StudentVoice course-evaluation tool, students will complete a single course-evaluation instrument online for each course in which they are enrolled. A window for completing the evaluation of a specific course will occur during the last two weeks of each term and session. The end dates associated with the sessions are used to determine the window of completion, the grade hold period, and the release date of the results. Students not completing the evaluation during the appropriate window will not have access to their final grades during the exam period and for an additional 10-day period afterwards.
- C. The Department may develop additional questions to supplement the StudentVoice instrument and/or develop a secondary evaluation instrument specific to their courses according to University Assessment requirements.

- D. Student evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner to assure the confidentiality of the student. Note that a minimum number of responses is sometimes required for the faculty member to have access to the evaluation(s).
3. In cases where quantitative student evaluations are problematic, grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, may be considered for additional analysis.
 4.
 - a. General Standards and Expectations for Teaching and Advising
 - Faculty should be primarily concerned with excellence in teaching. They should demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively and to promote student mastery of skills, concepts, and materials.
 - Faculty must prepare a syllabus for each course they teach. The syllabus must state the general and specific course objectives, forms of evaluation, and standards expected.
 - Faculty are expected to study and renew or modify approaches regularly and be willing to consider suggestions to improve their teaching from students and peers.
 - Faculty are responsible for choosing and ordering texts and other materials appropriate to the courses they are teaching.
 - Faculty are obligated to evaluate students fairly, equitably, and in a manner appropriate to the course and its objectives, and to adhere to University evaluation and grading policies. Grading procedures should be clearly explained in syllabi. Students should be sufficiently assessed that they may know the level of their achievement before the end of the withdrawal period and at mid-semester.
 - Faculty will meet classes, independent- study students, and graduate students for mid-term and final reviews regularly as scheduled. Emergencies or illness must be reported to the Art office as soon as possible so that students can be notified. Ordinarily the instructor is responsible for seeing that all classes and students are accommodated--either with a substitute teacher, a make-up lesson, or another suitable solution.
 - During the first week of each semester, faculty with independent studies will arrange their meeting schedules and provide students with a course syllabus.
 - In addition to consultation with students by appointment, telephone, and e-mail, faculty will maintain at least one office hour per three credits hours of teaching. Faculty will post schedules on their office doors.

- Faculty will participate in the annual faculty-evaluation process, which primarily comprises the performance of peer evaluations.
- Faculty approved for graduate teaching will serve on MFA review committees and thesis defense committees.

b. Standards and expectations for Reappointment:

1. Knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field
2. Refinement, updating, and improvement of courses that one teaches
3. Effective and successful participation in course and program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or one's sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
 - a. Demonstrated leadership in course and program development
 - b. Carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi
 - c. Expertise and currency in the content of one's teaching
 - d. Availability to students
 - e. Strong evidence of potential for meeting the standards for tenure at the time of the tenure decision

c. Standards for promotion to Assistant Professor:

1. The standards for reappointment
2. Advising (see VI B 2 below)

d. Standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Standards a-d listed under reappointment
2. Effective teaching as demonstrated by the following potential evidence:
 - a. Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation, and grading of students' performance
 - b. Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology in one's teaching
 - c. Content of courses and teaching processes are supportive of department mission
 - d. Responsiveness to cultural and individual difference
 - e. Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation, ordinarily at least a 4.0 overall average on a scale of 0.0-5.0
 - f. Effective instruction as measured by student evaluation, ordinarily at least a 3.0 overall average on a scale of 0.0-5.0
 - g. Recognition in the department and the college of the quality of one's teaching
 - h. Other evidence put forward by the faculty member

e. Standards for promotion to Professor:

1. The standards listed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
2. Excellence in teaching which, in addition to such base expectations as regular attendance, respect for students, and clear and complete syllabi, ordinarily includes student and peer evaluations averaging at least 4.0 on a scale of 0.0-5.0

and support from a pattern of student and peer praise for such assets as dynamism, organization, and the ability to engage students.

3. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching

5. Advising – Towson University considers advising an important faculty responsibility.

Standards and expectations for advising (all full-time faculty does not include first- year full-time faculty):

- a. Accessible to students for advising sessions
- b. Schedule formal advising hours each semester
- c. Be familiar with transfer policies, Online Services procedures, and TU catalog requirements
- d. Assist students with the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their professional goals
- e. Assist students with course planning (understand curriculum, policies, and procedures; assess objectives and available choices; explore alternative courses of action)
- f. Mentor and evaluate student scholarship and creative activity
- g. When possible, advise academic honor societies and other student groups, and serve on graduate research committees

C. Departmental Standards and Expectations for Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, and/or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development, an active and sustained program of scholarly/creative activity consistent with his/her appointment, and currency in his/her academic field as affirmed by its community of scholars.

The Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education PRM Committee looks at peer review and dissemination as ways to validate a candidate's scholarship and/or creative activity. In presenting scholarly/creative materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues.

The committee makes distinctions between local, regional, and national/international dissemination of research. A faculty member who peaks or performs only on campus will not receive the highest level of evaluation. On the other hand, some “local” venues are also of the very highest quality—e.g., a performance at the Kennedy Center, or a book published by Johns Hopkins University Press.

The committee recognizes that, in combination with the scholarship of application and discovery, the scholarship of integration and teaching are viable forms of research over the arc of a faculty member’s career.

Scholarship of Application: applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and 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 ideas, methods and technologies that improve teaching and learning. Disseminating this work to relevant publics via articles, presentations, media productions, websites, etc.

Appropriate kinds of scholarship.

The following list of activities presents the more obvious forms (but not every possible form) in which scholarship/creative activity will be demonstrated:

- Exhibitions: solo or group art exhibitions, art performances, design and/or art annuals and competitions (print or online), film festivals, tours, screenings, installations, multimedia performances.
- Publication: articles, chapters, books, reviews, conference papers, exhibition catalogs, journal editorial duties, Internet publication on the history/theory/criticism of art, and related media.
- Presentations or lectures: guest speaker, visiting artist, speaker on panel presentations, poster sessions, conference presentations, conference workshops, conference course instruction
- Distribution: theatrical, broadcast, cable, Internet, gallery sales, film/video/audio sales, inclusion in collections, corporate/institutional sales or client work (e.g., for industrials or designers).
- Academic preparation: conference participation, degrees, courses, workshops, and technical/course pedagogy.
- Management of computer labs, fabrication labs, equipment cribs, printing centers or media labs is considered primarily a service function. However, such responsibilities may involve some research (e.g., management practices, programming, safety regulations, new generations of equipment, equipment upgrades, facilities/labs redesign, and production and post-production workflow).

On a department-wide basis, these forms of scholarship are considered equally valid "scholarship" activities for reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion, merit, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure review purposes.

Interdisciplinary work, which may include both teaching and research, is a vital part of the activity of the modern university. The Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education PRM Committee will evaluate interdisciplinary work as having equal "weight" with work done entirely within the department.

The Department gives additional "weight" to peer-reviewed/juried exhibitions, publications, screenings, festivals, etc.

The department recognizes competitive client-work, selection for exhibition/publication in reputable commercial venues, and inclusion in quality, curated exhibits as a form of peer-reviewed dissemination.

Efforts to obtain funding to support one's scholarship or creative and pedagogical goals are encouraged but not required

Faculty are expected to expand the knowledge base in their respective fields by items under either 1. or 2. below, or by a combination of 1. and 2.

1. Conducting research and generating new knowledge and creative products. This roughly correlates with Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Application.

The standards and expectations for **reappointment**:

- a. A clearly defined scholarship/creative agenda and focus
- b. Expertise in methods appropriate to one's scholarship and/or creative agenda
- c. Strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at the time of the tenure decision

The standards for **promotion to Assistant Professor**:

- a. The standards for reappointment
- b. Award of terminal degree

The standards for tenure and **promotion to Associate Professor**:

- a. Standards a-b under "reappointment"
- b. Evidence that one's research agenda or scholarly achievement has matured over time
- c. Dissemination of one's scholarship and creative work to appropriate publics
- d. Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship or artistic expression

The standards for promotion to **Professor**: The above standards for tenure plus the demonstrated ability to sustain an active exhibition/publication agenda over time. This might include multiple or single exhibitions, publications, etc. that are recognized by one's peers and the committee as valuable to one's area of expertise.

2. Synthesizing and integrating knowledge. This roughly correlates with Scholarship of Integration and Scholarship of Teaching.

The standards for **reappointment**:

- a. Currency in the knowledge base that encompasses one's field of inquiry
- b. Application of that knowledge base to one's teaching, service, and other professional activities
- c. Strong evidence of potential for meeting the standards for tenure at the time of that decision

The standards for **promotion to Assistant Professor**:

- a. The standards for Reappointment
- b. Award of terminal degree

The standards for tenure and **promotion to Associate Professor**:

- a. Standards a-b under "Reappointment"
- b. Continued interaction with others internally and externally who share one's knowledge base
- c. Reviews of the knowledge base in one's field (via articles, conference papers, or other forums), identification of critical themes, and recommendations for extending that knowledge base

The standards for **promotion to Professor**: the above standards for tenure plus these additional standards

- a. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to integrate knowledge in their field
- b. Continued engagement with changes in one's field over time, through the generation of new creative output based on the knowledge base in one's field or through development of new curriculum that reflects shifts in education and culture.

Faculty reviews of all types should give due attention to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's continuing professional development. Although some faculty may emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios. Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, museum-going, attendance at performances, research in preparation of new courses, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the department and college committees, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, although they will not substitute for the evidence of a sustained pattern of completed work required for tenure or promotion.

D. Departmental Standards and Expectations for Service

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

Diverse profiles of service contributions are anticipated among faculty candidates.

Outstanding contributions in one category can balance more routine service in other categories

General Standards and Expectations for Service

- A faculty member will actively serve on departmental, college, and/or university committees and will participate in department and division meetings.
- A faculty member shares the responsibility of university governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.
- A faculty member respects the creative and scholarly activities of Towson University faculty and students.
- A faculty member honors departmental and university deadlines and submits reports and other work in a timely fashion.
- A faculty member will be available for departmental and committee meetings during the period of their contractual obligations.
- Faculty are encouraged to engage in civic service in the larger community and take part in professional organizations in ways that advance the university's mission.

Institutional Service Standards

The standards for **reappointment** as instructor or Assistant Professor:

1. Involvement in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, College, and/or University levels.
2. Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise.

The standards for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:

1. Active and substantial participation in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, College, University, and/or System levels, as in serving on one or more committees at the department and university level or serving through participation in other activities that are deemed valuable to the department and/or university, such as starting a university-wide volunteer program, etc..
2. Active and substantial contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise, such as advising the University on campus art displays.
3. Advocacy in addressing important institutional issues
4. Recognition by the department, college, or university of the quality and impact of one's service

The standards for **Promotion to Professor**: The standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

1. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues
2. Distinction in the quality of one's service to the institution at program, department, college, university, and/or system levels as in chairing committees, areas, or the department,

establishing organizations that serve the university, guiding institutions already affiliated with the university, such as a campus art gallery, or actively participating in areas/committees that are heavy in service, such as coordinating department assessments or maintaining inventory and equipment for high-consumption and/or technology-driven areas (e.g., three-dimensional printing and design).

Professional Service Standards

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

Standard for **reappointment** as instructor or Assistant Professor: Involvement with practitioners and/or with professional organizations

Standard for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**: Active and substantial involvement with practitioners and/or professional organizations, such as holding office, serving on an advisory committee, acting as an outside reviewer, jurying shows

Standard for **promotion to Professor**:

1. The standard for tenure and promotion
2. Leadership in addressing issues in one's field
3. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance such as organizing a juried show, serving as president of a major professional organization, editing a professional publication, or making other substantial, documented contributions to a professional organization outside the university.

Community Service Standards

Standard for **reappointment**: Involvement in and/or engagement of the larger community (local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the department's, college's, or university's mission

Standard for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**: Active and substantial involvement in and/or engagement of the larger community in ways that advance the department's, college's, or university's mission, such as lecturing to local organizations, jurying local shows, or starting volunteer programs that benefit local communities

Standards for **promotion to Professor**:

1. The standard for tenure and promotion
2. Leadership in collaboratively addressing issues important to the community
3. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance such as organizing multiple shows open to local artists and easily accessible to the local communities around the university, establishing a

sustained pattern of lecturing for or otherwise contributing to local organizations, or establishing and overseeing enduring volunteer programs that benefit local communities.

E. Appropriate Terminal Degree

To be eligible for promotion and tenure faculty must possess an appropriate terminal degree. When the particular situation merits, there is one procedure by which an academic degree other than the terminal degree will be accepted as an appropriate terminal degree and provide all rights and privileges of the terminal degree:

Faculty With Distinguished Professional Experience

Designation for extraordinary status under the policy “Qualifications and Procedures for Promoting to Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor Extraordinary Faculty Who Do Not Hold A Terminal Degree” is found in the *Towson University Faculty Handbook*, Chapter 4.

F. Award of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The faculty member recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance commensurate with the University’s mission. The faculty member shall have demonstrated a passion for and excellence in teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio and the criteria of the department and college, such as consistent overall, student evaluations of 3.5 or higher on a scale of 0.0-5.0. By having multiple works accepted to refereed journals or juried shows, the faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship/creative activity meeting department standards of dissemination and validation, and where applicable shown competence to offer graduate instruction and to direct graduate research. The faculty member shall also have supplied evidence of relevant and effective service, such as emails documenting contributions to committee deliberations.

G. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor carries the recognition of maturity and distinction in teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service in the Department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education. Since teaching is the foremost criterion for promotion, a faculty member seeking the rank of Professor should show evidence of a consistent and long-standing record of achievement as a teacher, such as consistent overall student evaluations of 4.0 or higher and evidence of and reflections upon the evolution of the candidate’s procedures, strategies and philosophy of teaching.. In the area of scholarship/creative activity the faculty member’s contributions should demonstrate an on-going and successful agenda that receives recognition by one’s professional peers within and beyond the institution. The faculty member should also demonstrate on-going and mature leadership in the area of service to the Department, College, University, and/or profession.

VII. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. Documentation and Material Inclusion

1. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with the faculty member.
2. 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 his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
3. In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review (includes annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and 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. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:
 1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. Summary letter in which annual accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service are delineated as well as a request for merit or merit-plus
 - ii. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
 - iii. current *Curriculum vitae*;
 - iv. syllabi of all courses taught during the year under review;
 - v. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:

(A) all student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;

(B) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
 2. documentation of scholarship and service.
 3. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track and lecturer faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. all of the above items listed above and
 - ii. 2 peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) per year of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.
 - iii. Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:
 - iv. all of the above items listed
 - v. syllabi of all courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
 - vi. all student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (one evaluation per semester) years and the fall semester of the current year; and
 - vii. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
 4. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
 - i. all materials listed above from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion, whichever is more recent; and
 - ii. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.

- iii. Evaluation portfolio materials for comprehensive five-year review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - iv. all materials listed above for all five (5) years, including documentation of scholarship and service.
 - v. Two peer evaluation of teaching for the entire period under review; and
 - vi. a reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five (5) years of his/ her work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and articulating the candidate's plan for the foreseeable future, ideally the next five years.
5. 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.
 6. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or his/her 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 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 Calendar (Section VI). The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson's or program director'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 Calendar (see appendix).
 7. If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her 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 chair of any such information added to the evaluation portfolio after the second Friday in November.
 8. If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other than his/her 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, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) 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.
 9. 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.
 10. Copies of the chairperson's or program director'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.
 11. In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion, tenure, and/or comprehensive review shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost in accordance with the Provost's requirements at that time. As much corroborative material as possible should be submitted in additional, but separate, binders. With the exception of those seeking tenure or promotion or appealing department recommendations, it is possible that corroborative materials will not be examined beyond the departmental level; therefore, faculty are encouraged to make a convincing case in their AR forms and narrative statements. AR forms should clearly indicate the faculty member's percentages for teaching, scholarship and service.
- B. Faculty are encouraged to consult the *Towson University Faculty Handbook* for information regarding supporting materials. As much evidence as possible, especially in the area of teaching, facilitates the peer- review process.
- C. All documents, including observation reports and letters, which were considered and utilized by the Department PRM Committee, must be made available to the faculty member being considered.

VIII. DEPARTMENT OF ART+DESIGN, ART HISTORY, ART EDUCATION PRM AND TENURE

COMMITTEES

All tenured faculty of the department serve as members of the department's Tenure Committee (**faculty on sabbatical may vote on tenure decisions if they have attended the required meetings**). This committee is responsible for tenure recommendations and third-year review. The tenure committee may or may not be the same as the Promotion, Reappointment, and Merit (PRM) Committee(s). Faculty must be present at the meeting in order to vote. All are obligated to participate. A chair and a secretary will be elected at the first meeting of the Tenure Committee. It is the responsibility of the chair of the departmental Tenure Committee to provide all materials to the COFAC PTRM Committee.

Eligible members of the department PRM committee(s) shall be determined by the standards specified in the department's document as approved by the college PTRM committee, the dean, and the university PTRM committee. The department PRM committee(s) shall make recommendations concerning reappointment, merit, promotions, and comprehensive five-year review. The department PRM committee may or may not be the same as the tenure committee. Only tenured faculty members will vote in the committee(s) for promotion to associate professor or professor.

The department PRM Committee shall be comprised two (2) faculty from each of the ranks of Full, Associate, and Assistant professor plus one (1) faculty member at the rank of Lecturer totaling seven (7) voting members, plus the Chairperson of the Department as a non-voting member of the department PRM committee. The seven faculty representatives are selected by written ballot by the entire full-time tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty. Only tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty with three (3) or more full-time years in teaching in the Towson University department of Art+Design, Art History, Art Education, are eligible to serve on the committee (lectureship and visiting years may be considered toward full-time status). Whomever represents the department on the COFAC PTRM committee shall also serve on the department PRM committee, ex-officio. Should they happen to be elected to serve on the department PRM committee, they shall be a voting member at the department level in addition to their duties at the COFAC level. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave are ineligible to serve on the committee. Should it ever arise that there are fewer than two (2) at rank to serve, then the entire faculty will vote on at-large representative(s) from any rank to serve. If the PRM committee cannot be fully staffed by department faculty, faculty members from other COFAC departments may be substituted following the procedure described in the University ART document. The election of the committee membership will take place annually by the first Friday in May at a faculty meeting. Each member of the PRM Committee has to be elected by a simple majority of the faculty. Faculty must be present at the meeting in order to vote. All faculty are obligated to participate. A committee chair will be elected at the first meeting of the Tenure and PRM Committees. It is the responsibility of the chair of the departmental PRM committee to provide all materials to the COFAC PTRM Committee.

There must be five (5) faculty present to form a quorum of the PRM Committee. The Tenure Committee must have two-thirds of tenured faculty present to form a quorum. A majority (3 out of 5; 4 out of 6) carries the vote. Only faculty attending the meeting may vote.

The Committees will make a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure of a faculty candidate to the Chair of the COFAC PTRM Committee.

All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews taken the department committee shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

All deliberations pertaining to annual faculty evaluations, reappointment, merit, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review at all levels shall be confidential.

A. Peer-Observation Procedures

A minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per year for non-tenured faculty members who are beyond their first year at Towson; a minimum of one (1) peer observation shall be conducted per year for tenured faculty members. For faculty members required to submit a portfolio before completing two full semesters at the university, a minimum of one (1) peer observation shall be conducted during their first semester.

Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.

- The observer is responsible for consulting with the faculty member on a mutually agreeable observation assignment and date. This consultation takes place at least one week prior to the

observation. The observer should also obtain a copy of the syllabus for the course being observed.

- After the observation, the observer completes the form within seven (7) days of the observation date and delivers the form to the department Chair.
- A teaching observation form, ordinarily one page in length, is a critical analysis of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. The report is not intended to be a chronological listing of events, quotations, discussions, etc., but rather a critical document that uses those items to support a conclusion. The report is submitted to the department Chair, who will view it and put a copy in the faculty file and return the original to the faculty member within 14 days of the observation.
- In the event of a negative observation report, or at the faculty member's request, the department chair will discuss the report with the faculty member.
- In the event of a negative observation report, a faculty member may request that a third observation be made.

B. Calendar Deadlines

The deadlines for the department PRM Committee are based on a static calendar and enumerated elsewhere in this document. These deadlines must comply with the University deadlines that can be found in the faculty handbook.

IX. MERIT

A. General

In conjunction with cost-of-living adjustments to faculty salaries, which should be mandated annually, Board of Regents regulations require that merit salary increases be awarded using a merit system that results in differential increments. The "Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Faculty," the "Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations (AFWE)," section of the Annual Report (AR form Part II), or the "Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR form Part II)" shall serve as the basis for merit evaluation. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations. All faculty will be evaluated each year at the department level for merit. Because promotion and tenure decisions are based on long-term contributions, annual merit decisions do not necessarily indicate progress toward tenure or promotion.

Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. There are three (3) categories of merit.

1. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
2. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.

3. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

A rating of satisfactory shall mean at minimum that

1. The faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in this document under the categories of:
 - a. General Standards and Expectations (section VI A - page 3)
 - b. General Standards and Expectations for Teaching (section VI B 1 a -page 4), and Advising (section VI 2 B 2 -page 6), **and**
 - c. General Standards and Expectations for Service (section VI D -page 10);
2. The faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as evidenced in the sources of evidence appropriate to annual review as described above, such as student evaluations averaging at least 3.0 overall on a scale of 0.0-5.0 and including multiple patterns of positive comments pertaining to such universal teaching virtues as clarity, dynamism, and organization;
3. The faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly/creative work through the annual report, whether that work has been completed or is in progress, as in contributing to a group show or conference, applying to one or more group shows or conferences, or progressing towards a larger project such as a solo show or monograph. (d) The faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service, including such accomplishments listed under the criteria expected for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and as evidenced by such information as records of the candidate's direct contributions to a committee, e.g., suggestions for revisions to promotion and tenure criteria.

A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of as stated above (Section IX A 1) in this document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. For example, excellence in teaching might be evidenced by an overall, average score of at least 4.0 on a scale of 0.0-5.0, in contrast to an overall average score of at least 3.0 for satisfactory teaching; excellence in scholarship might be evidenced by exhibiting in multiple group shows, mounting a solo show, publishing an article or book, receiving and award, having one's work included in a prestigious exhibit or publication; and excellence in service is usually a combination of quantity and leadership, and could involve successfully completing a major service project, such as overhauling curriculum in one's area. In any case, evaluation of accomplishment meriting a rating of excellent shall be made in accordance with the proportion of a faculty member's time allocated to each area of responsibility in the annual workload assignment.

B. Criteria

Faculty can document professional competence by meeting the expectations shown in the "Department of Art Expectations and Standards" portion of this document and by successfully completing work contracted through the workload document. Faculty should negotiate a workload that accurately reflects what they plan to accomplish. When workload projections change significantly during the year, the workload document should be renegotiated to reflect the change.

Documentation of teaching effectiveness involves a combination of factors. The following are among the factors that can be used for that purpose: consistent class or lesson attendance; adequate preparation; publication of syllabi that demonstrate a thoughtful approach to learning and clearly state expectations, grading procedures, etc.; receipt of consistently good student evaluation results; appropriate use of technology; etc.

C. Procedure

Members of the PRM Committee must carefully read the dossiers of all faculty before the meeting. Review of faculty dossiers may begin on August 1 of each year, allowing members of the PRM committee time to review files for missing, incorrect, or incomplete materials. The chair of the committee will provide feedback to any faculty with an incomplete dossier in order to have completed files by the final September deadline.

Merit is decided by discussion and ballot. The PRM Committee meets and casts a confidential secret ballot vote either to award a faculty member excellent (base merit plus), satisfactory (base merit), or not meritorious (base) after the discussion of each faculty member's dossier.

After determining the level of merit, all dossiers of faculty receiving merit are further discussed to determine on which area (teaching, service, scholarship) to base their merit. If consensus is not reached by discussion, a vote will be taken. The merit statement will include language indicating that the highlighting of a particular area does not imply that the faculty member was not judged excellent in other areas. The PRM Committee chair records the vote and prepares a merit statement for each faculty member.

VII. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

Procedure

At the conclusion of the fall semester during a tenure-track candidate's third year at Towson University, the department Tenure Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review, as defined by the university. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member.

The faculty member's interim evaluation portfolio shall be reviewed by the department's Tenure Committee as outlined in the *Towson University Faculty Handbook*.

VIII. TENURE and/or PROMOTION PROCEDURE

A faculty member requesting promotion and/or tenure must notify the Department Chair 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.

All members of the Tenure and/or PRM Committees must read the dossiers of faculty requesting promotion and/or tenure.

The Tenure and/or PRM Committee discusses the case, and may request additions, deletions, or revisions. The Committee members then vote on recommending promotion and/or tenure.

The department Tenure and/or PRM Committee shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The report should contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university/civic/professional service.

The report should also be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (set forth in the department PTRM document) and submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October.

The Committee members vote, and the Tenure and/or PRM Chair submits the written report to the department chairperson. The department chairperson adds the chair's written evaluation to the evaluation portfolio. The Tenure and/or PRM Chair submits the written evaluations and dossier to the

Dean's Office for the COFAC PTRM.

The department PTRM committees' report(s) with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

IX. COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

Upon earning tenure, a faculty member begins a cycle of reviews conducted every five years. The department chairperson will maintain records and notify the PRM Committee chairperson and all tenured faculty of the review rotation schedule.

A tenured faculty member who has been successfully promoted will have his/her five-year clock reset to five years after the year in which he or she was last promoted or last submitted a five-year portfolio, whichever is more recent.

The faculty member under review is responsible for preparing an expanded dossier and writing a detailed five-year narrative report not to exceed five typed pages. Corroborating materials are not necessarily required for the comprehensive review but may be requested by the PRM Committee.

The committee uses the candidate's expanded dossier along with its observations as the basis for the review. The committee may recommend that the candidate's narrative is accurate and true, or it may submit a written report detailing any discrepancies or problems identified. The final recommendation must be approved by a majority vote of the full PRM Committee.

The PRM Committee submits a full report, as defined by the university, documenting the recommendation for each five-year review.

The department PRM Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section (Section V) of the University ART document.

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

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.

When the PRM Committee must follow up an unsatisfactory review, it focuses solely on those aspects of the unsatisfactory review noted as problems. Faculty members undergoing follow up reviews should resubmit the dossier containing the materials of the previous unsatisfactory review, as well as the current year's standard dossier. The Committee considers the current standard dossier, the previous expanded dossier, and the previous Committee report of the five-year review.

In a follow up review, the PRM Committee will determine if the faculty member has made a significant and sincere effort to remedy the problem(s) cited in the unsatisfactory review. If affirmative, the Committee can recommend that the five-year review be considered satisfactory.

X. PTRM CALENDAR

The First Friday in May

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

The Third Friday in June

- A. All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair. Absent truly extenuating circumstances, faculty dossiers must be submitted by this deadline in order for the candidate to be eligible for reappointment or tenure. The Tenure Committee rules, in the case of untenured faculty, on questions regarding circumstantial extenuation.
- B. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty from COFAC departments to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chairperson and dean.
- C. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

August 1 (USM mandated)

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

The First Friday in September

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

The Third Friday in September

- A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- B. College PTRM Committee approval of COFAC faculty to be added to a department's PRM Committee (if necessary).
- C. 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.
- D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

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 PRM Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in October

- A. Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
- B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- C. The department PRM 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 PRM Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PRM chairperson to deliver 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 December

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

The Second Friday in December

First-year tenure-track faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

The First Friday in January

The department PRM Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

The Third Friday in January

- A. The department PRM Committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.
- B. All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.
- C. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

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.

First Friday in March

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

XI. APPEALS

A. Negative Recommendations

Negative recommendations regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the faculty member's last known address by the chair. Negative recommendations must be postmarked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

B. Appeals

There are three kinds of appeals in the PTRM process: substantive, procedural, and appeals alleging discrimination. For a full discussion of appeals, see the ART document.

1. Appeals of substantive matters for Department decisions on Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review should go to the COFAC Dean's office for the COFAC PTRM Committee and be copied to the department chair and the department's PRM chair. Appeals must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal, and must be accompanied by supporting documents. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the college Dean within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation
2. 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 certified mail or in person to the UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PRM chair, the dean, and the university PTRM Committee chair.
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."

XII. REFERENCE SOURCES

Additional information concerning tenure and promotion can be found on the Towson University website <http://www.towson.edu>

Recommended documents for faculty review:

Link to Faculty Handbook:

<https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/>

Link to Third-year review policy is available off of the Academic Resources web page:

<https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/>