

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

Approved by department:

October 14, 2020

Approved by College of Liberal Arts PTRM Committee:

12/17/2020

Approved by Dean of the College of Liberal Arts:

4/13/2021

Approved by UPTRM:

4/13/2021

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE

I.	MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE....	1
II.	POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE	
	PTRM Chair, History Chair, Secretary, PTRM Duties, Promotion Subcommittee..	1
	Quorum, Voting Procedures, Confidentiality	2
	Notification of Candidates, Publication of Decisions, Appeals... ..	3
	Review of PTRM Document, Changes in Policies, Annual Report... ..	4
	Promotion and Tenure.....	5
	Third Year Review Procedures... ..	5
	Five Year Comprehensive Review... ..	5
	Reappointment... ..	5
	Merit	6
	Letter Signing Procedures	7
III.	EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE....	8
IV.	MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION	
	Overview.....	8
	Portfolio Organization... ..	9
	Summative Portfolio... ..	10
	Student Evaluations, Peer Teaching Evaluations.....	11
	Lecturers	12
	SENTF	12
	Chairperson’s Annual Report.....	12
V.	STANDARDS AND CRITERIA	
	Overview.....	12
	Teaching, Student Evaluations and Peer Review.....	14
	Scholarship.....	17
	Service.....	19
	Chairpersons... ..	20
	Reappointment... ..	20
	Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor... ..	21
	Third Year Review.....	22
	Promotion to Full Professor... ..	22
	Five Year Comprehensive Review... ..	23
	Merit.....	23
VI.	CALENDAR.....	24
	Appendix A: PTRM Calendar.....	25
	Appendix B: History Department Peer Evaluation Form... ..	28

1 **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT**

2 **PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE**

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

6
7 I. **MEMBERSHIP OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE**

8
9 All faculty members with tenure in the History Department will be members of the
10 PTRM Committee. In May, after the election of the History representative to the CLA
11 PTRM Committee and the final announcement from the Provost on promotion and
12 tenure, the History PTRM Committee for the next academic year will be formed.
13 Subcommittees will be created as detailed below.

14
15 II. **POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE PTRM COMMITTEE CHAIR,
16 HISTORY DEPARTMENT CHAIR, AND THE PTRM COMMITTEE**

17
18 A. The Chair of the History PTRM Committee will be elected by the History
19 Department PTRM Committee for a three-year term during the spring semester.
20 The Chair's duties include calling and managing meetings, ensuring that personnel
21 decisions are made according to the process outlined in this document, overseeing
22 the efforts of subcommittees, writing letters of recommendation, assisting faculty
23 in the creation of their tenure or promotion files, and other duties as necessary.
24 Whenever the History PTRM Committee Chair excuses him/herself from
25 deliberations on his/her own materials or is unable to attend a meeting, the senior
26 member of the remaining Committee will serve as chair. If the History PTRM
27 Chair is unable to serve because of a sabbatical leave, faculty, exchange,
28 promotion consideration, or for any other reason, the History Department PTRM
29 Committee will choose an acting chair for the period of replacement.

30
31
32
33
34 At the first formal meeting of the History PTRM Committee each academic year
35 the Committee will vote for a secretary. The secretary will be obliged to serve for
36 only one academic year.

37
38 The History Department Chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the PTRM
39 Committee and shall participate in all deliberations regardless of her/his academic
40 rank, except for deliberations on her/his own dossier. As detailed in the ART and
41 the CLA PTRM documents, the History Chair prepares an independent
42 recommendation in each case and includes these recommendations and those of
43 the Committee in candidate files before transmitting them to the CLA PTRM
44 Committee. The History Chair shall maintain a copy of all official documents

45 concerning evaluation recommendations. The History Chair is not required to
46 write letters regarding annual merit determinations.

47
48 The History PTRM Committee and its subcommittees make recommendations on
49 promotion to Associate Professor, on the granting or denial of tenure, and on
50 reappointment. The History PTRM Committee and its subcommittees evaluate
51 candidates in relation to the standards and expectations established for faculty in
52 the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts,
53 and the criteria of the History Department. The History PTRM Committee and its
54 subcommittee will produce a concise but detailed statement in support of its
55 recommendation with reference to each category evaluated, including
56 teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. No
57 member of the History PTRM Committee or its subcommittees will participate in
58 deliberations or vote on his or her dossier.

59
60 For consideration of cases of tenure and reappointment the PTRM meets as a
61 whole.

62
63 For consideration of cases of promotion to full professor and for Five Year
64 Comprehensive Reviews, a separate Professor Subcommittee will be created.
65 This subcommittee will consist of full professors, who will participate in
66 deliberations and vote. In these cases, a quorum will be a majority of the full
67 professors in the Department, excepting the History Chair and faculty on leave or
68 sabbatical.

69
70 For recommendations on merit a Merit Subcommittee of the PTRM committee
71 will be created. See Section O below for membership and duties.

72
73 If the History PTRM Committee or its subcommittees reviews materials that have
74 been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the
75 review process consistent with the guidelines for such actions in University
76 policy, the Committee will note that it has done so in its recommendation.

77
78 B. Quorum

79
80 A quorum will consist of a majority of the voting members of the History PTRM
81 Committee, excluding faculty members on leave or on sabbatical, and the History
82 Chair. If fewer than three tenured faculty members (excluding the History Chair)
83 are available to serve on the History PTRM Committee, the PTRM process will
84 be modified in accordance with the ART and the CLA PTRM document. The
85 Merit Subcommittee requires five voting members for a quorum as detailed in O
86 below.

87
88 C. Voting Procedures

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

97
98 Faculty members on leave or sabbatical may vote if they review the materials as
99 required and attend the History PTRM Committee meetings. Even if faculty
100 members cannot participate, they will be informed of all meetings and the results
101 of those meetings. However, they will only be able to comment upon draft letters
102 or recommendations from the History PTRM Committee if they attend the
103 meeting where those decisions were reached.

104
105 A simple majority of those voting must support the granting of tenure or
106 promotion for the committee to reach a favorable recommendation. Because a tie
107 vote does not constitute a majority decision, any proposal met with a tie vote fails.

108 Committee members must be present in order to vote. No committee member
109 shall abstain from a vote for reappointment, third-year review, five-year
110 comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such
111 abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. Votes
112 on procedural matters may be made by a show of hands, and abstentions are
113 permitted.

114
115 D. Confidentiality

116
117 Members of the History PTRM committee will maintain strict confidentiality
118 concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after
119 the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or
120 departments by the History PTRM Committee Chair, History Chair, or CLA Dean
121 in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

122
123 E. Notification of Candidates of Decisions

124
125 The History PTRM Committee recommendation and a record of the vote count
126 shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the History PTRM
127 Chair and submitted to the History Chair as defined by the schedule in Appendix
128 A below. Faculty members will receive the recommendation and a record of the
129 vote count according to the schedule in Appendix A below. Negative
130 recommendations shall be delivered in writing or in person by the History PTRM
131 Chair or sent by certified mail, with return receipt requested, to the faculty
132 member's last known address. Reappointment, comprehensive review,
133 promotion, tenure, and merit recommendations shall be addressed to the Chair.
134 Third year review recommendations shall be addressed to the faculty member.
135 Five-year review letters must explicitly address the person's status toward
136 attaining the requirements for promotion. The candidate is encouraged to seek

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

138
139 Record of the faculty member's notification of PTRM decisions and of letters
140 related to the faculty member's reappointment, third-year review, five-year
141 comprehensive review, promotion, or tenure shall be tracked via the PTRM
142 Document Review Transmittal Form (if available) or by the faculty member's
143 signature.

144
145 F. Publication of Decisions

146
147 Other than meeting the reporting requirements of this document, the CLA PTRM
148 guidelines and the ART, recommendations of the History PTRM Committee are
149 not publicized.

150
151 G. Appeal Procedures

152
153 All appeals of History PTRM Committee decisions will follow the College PTRM
154 guidelines and section V of Appendix 3 of the ART.

155
156 H. Review of the History PTRM Document

157
158 Every three years after the first approval of this History PTRM policies and
159 procedures document, the History PTRM committee will review this document
160 and submit evidence of this review to the dean and to the UPTRM committee.
161 This review, and any required changes, will be submitted in compliance with the
162 calendar in Appendix A.

163
164 I. Changes in Policies

165
166 Changes to this document can be initiated by a majority vote of the History
167 PTRM Committee. All History tenure and tenure-track faculty will vote on the
168 proposed changes. Votes to accept or to change this document will be by
169 confidential ballot. Other procedural votes may be by show of hands.

170
171 All policies and procedures in this document shall remain in effect until changed
172 in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix 3 of the University ART
173 policy, including approval by the college PTRM committee, approval by the
174 dean, and approval by the UPTRM. Faculty members shall be evaluated for
175 tenure pursuant to the PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they
176 were first appointed to a tenure-track position. All changes will be submitted in
177 compliance with the schedule in Appendix A.

178
179 J. Annual Report

180

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

187
188 K. Promotion and Tenure

189
190 Procedures for promotion and tenure decisions will follow the guidelines of
191 Appendix 3, section III, of the ART and the CLA PTRM document. Candidates
192 for promotion and/or tenure should compile their materials as detailed in section
193 IV of this document in order to meet the standards in section V. The schedule for
194 this effort and the History and CLA PTRM evaluations is detailed in Appendix A.
195 After individually reviewing the materials and discussing the candidate's record
196 in the History PTRM Committee meeting, the Committee will vote to support or
197 not support the promotion and/or tenure file. The Committee will document its
198 findings and vote as detailed in this section. For cases of promotion to full
199 professor, however, a subcommittee of full professors will review the files and
200 vote.

201
202 L. Third Year Review Procedures

203
204 The Third Year Review procedures will follow the guidelines of Appendix 3,
205 section III, of the ART and the CLA PTRM document utilizing the materials
206 detailed in section IV and the standards set forth in section V below.

207
208 If a faculty member was hired on an accelerated tenure-track timetable resulting
209 from an agreement between faculty and dean or provost, this timetable shall
210 supersede the third year review. In those instances, the regular Annual Review by
211 the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the
212 History PTRM Committee may provide written feedback upon the request of the
213 candidate.

214
215 M. Five Year Comprehensive Review Procedures

216
217 The Comprehensive Review procedures will follow the guidelines of the ART
218 and CLA PTRM documents utilizing the materials detailed in section IV and the
219 standards set forth in section V below.

220
221 N. Reappointment

222
223 Reappointment of First Year, Second Year, and Third-Fifth Year Faculty will
224 follow the guidelines in the ART and the CLA PTRM documents utilizing the
225 materials detailed in section IV and the standards set forth in section V below.

226 The History PTRM Committee will also review folders from lecturers and visiting
227 assistant professors who serve more than one year. The instructions for those
228 folders are in section IV and standards for evaluation are in section V. These
229 deliberations will take place during the reappointment meeting for tenure track
230 faculty each fall. The History PTRM Chair will write a recommendation along
231 the lines of those for tenure track faculty which will focus exclusively on
232 teaching. The timing and distribution of those recommendations will be the same
233 as for tenure track faculty.
234

235
236 O. Merit
237

238 For the purpose of awarding merit a subcommittee, ‘The Merit Subcommittee,’
239 will be selected through an election held no later than the first Friday in May. The
240 Merit Subcommittee shall consist of five voting members (including the PTRM
241 Chair) plus an alternate. All members of the Merit Subcommittee must be full-
242 time tenured faculty. The Department Chairperson serves on the Merit
243 Subcommittee in an ex officio capacity and does not vote. If possible, at least one
244 of the voting members should be an Associate Professor and one should be a Full
245 Professor. One alternate member shall be elected to this subcommittee, and this
246 person will vote when a voting member of the subcommittee is absent or when the
247 member’s own merit is being discussed and voted upon. All votes require five
248 members of the subcommittee to cast ballots. No member may abstain from a
249 vote. Motions require a majority vote to be passed. Members (other than the
250 Department PTRM Chair) who have been elected to serve for two consecutive
251 terms must wait at least one year before being re-elected to this committee, unless
252 there are no other eligible members. Members who are on leave or otherwise are
253 not on campus to fulfill their duties for the full academic year are not eligible to
254 serve on this committee in that year. Faculty in their terminal year are not eligible
255 to serve on the committee. The results of the Merit Subcommittee’s decisions will
256 be disseminated to all tenure-track and tenured faculty.
257

258 1. Election of the Merit Subcommittee. By the second Friday in April
259 the Chair of the PTRM Committee shall solicit self-nominations
260 for election to the Merit Subcommittee for the academic year and
261 shall try to ensure the nomination of at least one associate
262 professor and one full professor. If five tenured faculty members
263 do not volunteer the PTRM Committee Chair will name the
264 members.
265

266 2. By the first Friday in May will vote for the Merit Subcommittee
267 according to confidential ballots. The Chair of the PTRM
268 Committee will tabulate the votes. The four individuals who
269 receive the most votes will be named as voting members, the
270 individual who receives the fifth highest number of votes will be
271 the alternate. In case of tie votes the Chair of the PTRM

273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318

Committee will name members according to those who have not served on the committee most recently.

3. Merit Subcommittee members will review the annual reports for the previous academic year, then vote by confidential ballot to create a list of recommendations on not meritorious, satisfactory, and excellent merit. Merit determination will be based on accomplishments during the one year covered by the annual report and the criterion detailed in section V to reach its decisions. Current rank is not a criterion for merit determinations. At least one person outstanding in each category will be recommended for excellent merit: teaching, scholarship, and service. All tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible to be considered for merit. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible for excellent merit unless they were on leave or sabbatical for two semesters of the annual report under review. The Subcommittee may select one or more of its own members for excellent merit provided that member is not involved in discussions or voting on their merit recommendation. If a pool of merit funds is available for lecturers, they will be included in this effort. Members of the Merit Subcommittee will write all merit letters.

4. The Chair of the PTRM committee will serve as the Chair of the Merit Subcommittee with the following responsibilities in addition to those in #1 and #2 above:
 - a. To call and conduct meetings of the Merit Subcommittee.
 - b. To give formal written notice of merit to the department chairperson to be passed on to the individuals concerned and to the proper College and University authorities and committees.
 - c. To tabulate votes and to run the meeting.
 - d. To assign members of the Merit Subcommittee to write Merit Recommendation letters addressed to the History Department Chair except for the Chair's own letter which is addressed to the Dean.
 - e. To sign all merit letters.
 - f. To lead a discussion of the Department Chair's performance each year prior to the Merit Subcommittee meeting devoted to merit. This discussion should occur either during a regular faculty meeting or the History PTRM Chair shall invite junior faculty to participate in part of a PTRM meeting, though they cannot vote on merit. Only after receiving input from tenure track faculty will the History Merit Committee make any determinations on merit of the History Department Chair. The History PTRM Chair will draft a letter for the CLA Dean with recommendations for not meritorious, satisfactory (base

319 merit), or excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance
320 Merit). A copy of this letter will be forwarded to the
321 History Chair.
322

323 5. Whenever the PTRM Chair is absent, the most senior member of
324 the remaining committee serves in his or her place.
325

326 P. Letter Signing Procedures
327

328 The History Department PTRM Chair is responsible for assigning PTRM
329 members to write all Tenure, Promotion, Merit, Reappointment, and Five-Year
330 Review letters. These letters will be signed by the History PTRM Chair (on behalf
331 of the committee) and by the faculty member to whom the letter applies. If a
332 faculty member discovers a grammatical or factual error both the History
333 Department PTRM Chair and the History Department Chair should be
334 immediately notified and it will be their responsibility to correct the mistake if
335 warranted.
336

337 III. EVALUATION BY MORE THAN ONE DEPARTMENT OR COMMITTEE
338

339 The History PTRM Committee will follow the procedures described in Section III
340 of the CLA PTRM document.
341

342 IV. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
343

344 A. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment,
345 third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review rests with
346 the faculty member.
347

348 B. Guided by the History Chair, the History PTRM Chair, and department and
349 college criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making
350 distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service
351 and shall include such distinctions in his or her narrative statements and other
352 documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
353

354 C. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for the annual
355 review process (which includes the Annual Review, reappointment, third-year
356 review, merit consideration, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) shall
357 be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial
358 role and expectations of faculty in the university, as well as the faculty member's
359 college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material
360 and process. The portfolio requirements are detailed below.
361

362 1. Large items, such as books that cannot be secured in a binder, may
363 be submitted separately. If there is more than one such item for a
364 faculty member, all such items pertaining to that faculty member

365 should be enclosed in a manila envelope or a box of suitable size
366 and the envelope or box labeled with the name of the faculty
367 member and a list of its contents. All such items submitted shall be
368 considered part of the evaluation portfolio.

369
370 2. Faculty who wish to submit work created digitally as part of their
371 portfolio should, whenever possible, include in their file in printed
372 form all of the work product or substantial examples conveying its
373 substance and quality. Digital addresses of web pages, blogs, sites,
374 or other locations may be included but there can be no expectation
375 that reviewers will visit these sites as a required part of the process.
376 Materials that cannot be printed, such as films, may be included on
377 a DVD in the portfolio within a protective binder sleeve or as an
378 accompanying item comparable to books as above.

379
380 D. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring
381 binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio if the University creates an
382 approved format for doing so). Binders should be organized using dividers with
383 tabs to identify the sections (electronic portfolios should be organized with similar
384 clarity, based on University standards once developed and using the technologies
385 available). Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed
386 pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. As
387 detailed in the ART, Appendix B, section IB, contents of the evaluation portfolio
388 are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

389
390 1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty
391 must include the following documents:
392 a. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR
393 (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) forms.
394 b. current *curriculum vitae*. The *curriculum vitae* should summarize
395 the candidate's education, teaching, and professional employment;
396 specific courses taught at Towson; honors and grants; scholarly
397 publications; professional presentations, associations, and
398 activities; and record of service to the university, the profession,
399 and the community.
400 c. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review.
401 d. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including
402 the following:
403 (i) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the
404 department chairperson or an administrative entity other
405 than the faculty member.
406 (ii) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this
407 document takes effect.
408 (iii) documentation of advising including but not limited to an
409 advising log.

- 410 (iv) Teaching narratives should be concise, should highlight
411 new procedures and courses, and should address peer and
412 student evaluations.
- 413 e. documentation of scholarship and service. This documentation
414 should include a copy of any publication, review, presentation,
415 grant application, or other item identified by the faculty member as
416 part of the faculty member's scholarly activity.
417
- 418 2. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review and reappointment of
419 tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:
420 a. all of the above items listed in D.1.
421 b. peer and/or chairperson's evaluations of teaching signed by
422 faculty member and evaluator.
423
- 424 3. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure
425 must include the following documents:
426 a. all materials listed above in D.1. and D.2. from the faculty
427 member's date of hire or last promotion.
428 b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how
429 he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service
430 expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period
431 under review.
432
- 433 4. The contents of Third Year Review and Five Year Comprehensive
434 Reviews folders are detailed in the ART.
435
- 436 5. If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating
437 in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her file rebutting
438 or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be
439 included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled
440 —Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration
441 process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than
442 November 30.
443
- 444 6. If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation
445 process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio,
446 other than his/her evaluation, that specific information shall be made
447 known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any
448 evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Record of the faculty
449 member's notification shall be tracked via the PTRM Document Review
450 Transmittal Form. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business
451 days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation
452 portfolio.
453
- 454 7.
455

456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499

E. In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion or tenure shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost that shall accompany the full evaluation portfolio from the beginning of the process. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member's name, department, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and 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 Report (AR I & II) or Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR I & II) Forms arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section III

- Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. The History Department may vote to develop a supplemental student evaluation system. Results from that system would also be included in this section. Any departmental forms will compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time
- A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Peer teaching evaluations.

Section IV

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

Section V

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

Section VI

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

- 501 F. Student evaluation forms used in the College of Liberal Arts shall ordinarily be
502 the University evaluation forms tabulated by the Office of Assessment. The
503 History Department as a whole may wish to use an additional form for student
504 evaluation, whether as an entire department or in selected courses not effectively
505 evaluated by the university form. In that case, the additional form will be included
506 in the History PTRM policies and procedures document along with a rationale for
507 its use and the process to be used for its administration. The form will be subject
508 to review and approval by the CLA PTRM Committee and the UPTRM
509 Committee. Any such student evaluation form may not be changed without formal
510 review and approval through the process provided for the History PTRM
511 document as a whole.
512
- 513 G. Peer evaluations of teaching are a required part of the review process. Further
514 information on the evaluation of teaching is contained in section V below.
515
- 516 H. Lecturers and visiting assistant professors who will teach in the History
517 Department for more than one year will be required to compile a folder following
518 the schedule of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion folders that are prepared
519 by other faculty. These lecturers and visiting assistant professors are responsible
520 for preparing their folder, which should include all syllabi from the previous
521 academic year, all student teaching evaluations from the previous year, and all
522 peer teaching evaluations. The lecturer or visiting assistant professor will also
523 provide a brief narrative statement detailing his or her contributions to teaching at
524 Towson University.
525
- 526 I. All material placed in a file, including challenge material, becomes part of the
527 cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio. No materials shall be removed
528 by subsequent levels of evaluators, provided the material was included following
529 the rules regarding the notification of the faculty member and the timeline of the
530 review process. Documents or statements prepared by a faculty member or
531 evaluation committee and included in the file should remain in the file in their
532 original form, with any changes handled through the processes provided in the
533 ART policy, Appendix 3.
534
- 535 J. All first year faculty shall complete the Statement of Standards and Expectations
536 for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF). In order to ensure that the History
537 PTRM Committee fairly evaluates tenure-track faculty for reappointment, third-
538 year review, merit, tenure, and promotion, the Committee should receive a copy
539 of the SENTF agreement for each faculty member. Discussions of teaching and
540 other activities should take place in the context of the expectations and
541 agreements made when the tenure-track faculty member came to Towson.
542
- 543 K. All chairs and program directors (with faculty) shall complete the Chairperson's
544 Annual Report (CAR, see Section VII) and Workload Agreement and include
545 these in their evaluation portfolios.
546

547 V. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

548
549 A. The History PTRM document conforms with section II of Appendix
550 3 of the

551 University ART policy and the CLA PTRM document in its evaluation processes
552 associated with annual reviews, reappointment, third-year review, merit,
553 promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review. In conducting these reviews,
554 departments should provide for an assessment of faculty performance that
555 calibrates expectations and judgments to the proportion of time allocated for each
556 area of responsibility in the faculty member's workload. A faculty member who
557 regularly allocates 25 percent of time to scholarship, for example, should meet
558 significantly higher expectations for scholarly outcomes than a faculty member
559 with 15 percent of time allocated to scholarship, and a faculty member allocating
560 15 percent of time to service should be providing notably more extensive service
561 than would be expected of a faculty member allocating 5 percent to this sphere.

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

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

572
573 2. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic
574 citizenship. Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and
575 responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair
576 processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on
577 matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational
578 functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of
579 humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality
580 and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for
581 similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background,
582 expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not
583 imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the
584 capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and
585 administrators.

586
587 3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college,
588 and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves
589 available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned
590 committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play
591 an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as

examples of such wider processes).

593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637

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

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

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

1. Self-evaluation and course materials

a. The faculty member's evaluation of his/her own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to which the faculty member wishes to call attention and should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair evaluations as appropriate.

b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and

- 638 should contain those elements specified for course syllabi in
639 university policy.
640
- 641 c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment
642 outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies
643 of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations,
644 community engagement, effective educational practices, or other
645 qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.
646
- 647 d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall
648 be made available to faculty members for review and shall be
649 included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be
650 considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental and
651 college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course
652 syllabi, the difficulty of the material taught, the course workload,
653 and the evaluations of students and peers.
654
- 655 2. Evaluation of teaching by students
656
- 657
- 658 a. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the
659 evaluation of faculty.
660
- 661 b. Unless the History Department as a whole votes to develop its own
662 form, the PTRM process will use the university-wide system. The
663 History Department may opt to recommend the cumulative use of
664 two evaluation forms.
665
- 666 c. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated for all courses
667 taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional
668 classroom, hybrid, and study abroad courses taught during the
669 academic year, minimester, and summer terms.
670
- 671 3. Evaluation of teaching by tenured peers
672
- 673
- 674 a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of
675 professional growth and are required when the person is being
676 considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or
677 tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the
678 comprehensive five-year review and for merit evaluations. The
679 teaching evaluation letters should be addressed to the History
680 PTRM Chair, and include the signature of the evaluator and the
681 faculty member evaluated. The PTRM Chair, the History Chair,
682 and the faculty member evaluated may wish to meet to discuss the
683 evaluation.
- b. In completing written peer teaching evaluations, reviewers will
adhere to the Peer Evaluation Form in Appendix B.

684
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
721
722
723
724
725
726
728

- 685 c. At a minimum, peer evaluations will be performed by History PTRM Committee members once every semester for tenure-track faculty during their first six (6) semesters (through the 3rd year review year) and then once a year until they receive tenure. Tenured Associate Professors should be evaluated once a year. Tenured Full Professors should be evaluated every other year with at least two evaluations completed for each five-year review. Full time lecturers and visiting assistant professors who will be at Towson more than one academic year will be evaluated every other semester (once each academic year). These guidelines do not include summer or minimester teaching.

At the start of each academic year, the History PTRM Committee Chair will select a two-person subcommittee, based on a rotating list to develop a list of evaluators and courses to evaluate in consultation with faculty. Membership of this subcommittee will be on a rotating basis. The Subcommittee members will select a Chair. A preliminary list of peer evaluators (who must be tenured faculty) and classes to evaluate will be completed in the first three weeks of each semester. The History Department as a whole may vote to require a template form or letter format for all peer teaching evaluations.
- 708 d. In every case the evaluator shall strive to choose a class meeting most amenable to the individual under evaluation. The faculty member being evaluated will have at least two weeks notice of any peer review. The evaluation shall not be performed in the final two weeks of the semester unless requested by the faculty member being evaluated. Evaluations must be completed, reviewed, signed, and filed with the History Department by the end of the semester in which they were performed. It is the Responsibility of the PTRM Chair to ensure these are completed.
- 4. Evaluation of advising
 - 720 a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.
 - 727 b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class-teaching responsibilities, advising

729 groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research
730 committee, or advising students formally or informally in other
731 professional contexts.
732

733 c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials
734 evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be
735 included in the evaluation portfolio. These may include but are not
736 limited to the evidence of regular and reliable records of the advice
737 given, discussion of advising by the faculty member in Annual
738 Review reports, logs of advising appointments, optional peer or
739 chair review of advising, notable instances of positive advising
740 contributions or of advising errors, letters of recommendation
741 written on behalf of students, research mentoring beyond the
742 expectations of course supervision, definable contributions through
743 organizational or group advising, evidence of significant
744 contributions to career advising, or other advising contributions for
745 the benefit of students as the department may determine.
746

747 E. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the
748 faculty member's tangible contributions to a discipline or an interdisciplinary
749 specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly
750 growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of
751 Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty
752 member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency
753 in his/her academic field, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as
754 demonstrated by the scholarly, peer-reviewed, materials in the faculty member's
755 evaluation portfolio.
756
757

758 1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:
759 a. **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to
760 consequential problems, either internal or external to the
761 university.
762 b. **Scholarship of Discovery** – traditional research, knowledge for its
763 own sake.
764 c. **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that
765 overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional
766 disciplines.
767 d. **Scholarship of Teaching** – exploring experience of effective
768 teaching and student learning through peer-reviewed publications.
769

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

- 775 to their scholarly growth. These forms of scholarship may, but not
776 exclusively, consist of
777
- 778 a. Scholarly monographs based on original research, subject to peer
779 review, and disseminated to the scholarly community by a
780 university press (or its equivalent).
781
 - 782 b. Scholarly journal articles (published in print/ and or digitally) or
783 book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally) based on
784 original research, subject to peer review, and disseminated to the
785 scholarly community.
786
 - 787 c. Scholarly edited article or essay collections (published in print/ and
788 or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to the
789 scholarly community.
790
 - 791 d. Scholarly historiographic journal articles (published in print/ and
792 or digitally) or book chapters (published in print/ and or digitally),
793 subject to peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly
794 community.
795
 - 796 e. Translations and/or document collections (published in print/ and
797 or digitally) that contain scholarly notes and discussions, subject to
798 peer review, and disseminated to the scholarly community.
799
 - 800 f. Museum or public history exhibitions (whether physical or digital)
801 based on scholarly research, subject to peer review, and
802 disseminated to the scholarly community when the faculty member
803 acts as curator.
804
 - 805 g. Bibliographies, resource guides, and research aides (published in
806 print/ and or digitally), subject to peer review, and disseminated to
807 the scholarly community.
808
 - 809 h. Public history or other research and public dissemination of
810 scholarship. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion
811 and/or tenure to make clear how these efforts illustrate intellectual
812 rigor and make a contribution to his or her field.
813
 - 814 I. Co-authored, co-edited, and collaborative examples of any of the
815 above forms of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the individual
816 to make clear their contributions to the work.
817
- 818 3. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a
819 record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or
820 promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed

821 work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the
822 work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly
823 or public community will have ready access and that the work has been
824 reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly
825 materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review
826 process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the
827 means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues.
828

829 4. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the
830 University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or
831 international, similar presentations involving review or recognition by
832 scholarly peers, and book reviews may all provide evidence of scholarly
833 engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress
834 toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may
835 not substitute for the pattern of completed work required in sections 3 and
836 4 above in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
837

838 Reprints of previously published materials show scholarly engagement
839 and support the growing reputation of faculty members, but do not count
840 as part of the scholarship necessary for promotion or tenure unless they
841 have been significantly revised from their original version. It is the duty
842 of the faculty member to show how the reprinted or republished work
843 makes a new contribution to the field.
844

845 5. Faculty reviews of all types, including annual reviews, merit
reviews,
846 third-year reviews, and comprehensive reviews, should give due attention
847 to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an
848 interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's
849 continuing professional development. Although some faculty may
850 emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload
851 assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop
852 disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of
853 professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios. Reports
854 on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, papers presented to
855 colleagues, systematic preparation for teaching topics new to the faculty
856 member, collection and analysis of data or information for a community
857 purpose, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the
858 department, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or
859 professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for
860 the evidence required in section 3 above in evaluation for tenure or
861 promotion.
862

863 F. To the extent possible, evaluation of service should consider the extent and
864 quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a
position
865 held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance

of

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

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

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

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

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

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

908 Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated based on their success at meeting the
909 requirements of the SENTF, and their gradual progress toward meeting the
910 university, CLA, and History Department standards for promotion and
tenure as

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

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

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

919
920 I. The expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the College
921 of Liberal Arts and tenure shall include the following. There may be unusual
922 circumstances when the History PTRM Committee choose to grant tenure but not
923 support immediate promotion.

924
925 1. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Associate Professor
926 shall hold the doctorate or recognized terminal degree in the field of
927 specialization and show continuing potential for superior performance
928 commensurate with the University's mission.

929
930 2. The faculty member ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in
931 teaching, as determined through the evidence in the evaluation portfolio
932 and the criteria of the department and college, and as defined by section V
933 above.

934
935 3. The faculty member shall have demonstrated successful experience in
936 research, provided evidence of a pattern of scholarship meeting standards
937 of dissemination and validation. At a minimum faculty are expected to
938 publish three (3) peer-reviewed articles/ book chapters or one (1)
939 monograph as defined by section V above. The History PTRM
940 Committee would expect a larger output—four or five items--of the other
941 items detailed in the scholarship section above. While it is understood that
942 faculty's academic interests will evolve, it is expected that their
943 scholarship remain consistent with historical study and related fields.

944
945 In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure,
946 the History PTRM Committee will consider anything published after the
947 faculty member began his or her tenure track position at Towson and
948 anything under contract prior to completing the promotion and tenure
949 folder for consideration by the Committee. If a work is under contract the
950 faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent
951 of progress.

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

914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956

957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002

- J. The expectations for the Third Year Review are based on progress toward promotion and tenure as detailed above. The three levels of progress are as follows:
- Superior. Requirements include excellence in teaching (in all its components including advising), excellence in scholarship and meeting department standards in service.
 - Satisfactory. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This essentially means that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.
 - Unsatisfactory. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.
- K. The faculty member recommended for promotion to Professor shall have all of the qualifications of an Associate Professor and shall have established an outstanding record of accomplishment in teaching, service, and scholarship since receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
1. The faculty member shall have demonstrated continuing growth as a teacher during the period since promotion to Associate Professor, as evidenced in annual reports, syllabi, and other evaluative materials on teaching included in the evaluation portfolio and as defined in section V above.
 2. The faculty member shall have demonstrated additional accomplishments as a scholar since promotion to Associate Professor. At a minimum faculty are expected to publish three (3) peer-reviewed articles/ book chapters or one (1) monograph as defined by section V above. The History PTRM Committee would expect a larger output—four or five items--of the other items detailed in the scholarship section above. While it is understood that faculty’s academic interests will evolve, it is expected that their scholarship remain consistent with historical study and related fields. The scholarly work as a whole should reflect a degree of cohesion consistent with establishing a national or international scholarly reputation.
- In order to clarify which publications count toward promotion and tenure, the History PTRM Committee will consider anything published while the faculty member served as an associate professor. If a work is under contract the faculty member shall also provide supporting materials showing the extent of progress. However, if the item was under contract prior to promotion and tenure, and the faculty member used the contract to advance his or her tenure and promotion case, it may not be used for the

- 1003 promotion to full professor. In short, any scholarship, whether under
1004 contract or in the final published version, may only be counted once.
1005 Anything under contract prior to completing the promotion to full
1006 professor folder may be considered. Finally, anything published after the
1007 file for promotion to associate professor and tenure was completed may be
1008 used for the promotion to full professor.
1009
- 1010 3. The faculty member shall have presented evidence of relevant and
1011 effective service to the University, the community, and the profession in
1012 the period after promotion to Associate Professor, as defined in section V
1013 above. Faculty members are expected to show leadership in university,
1014 CLA, and History Department initiatives, as well as effective mentorship
1015 of other faculty.
1016
- 1017 L. The expectations for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are based on the
1018 continuation of the performance and accomplishments required for promotion and
1019 tenure above. The two levels of evaluation for the Review are as follows:
1020
- 1021 1. Positive. Requirements include maintaining excellence in teaching and
1022 scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the
1023 department.
1024
- 1025 2. Negative. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or
1026 more dimensions: teaching, service, or scholarship. This essentially
1027 marks a clear decline from the accomplishments that justified promotion
1028 to full professor or the satisfactory record of a previous Five Year
1029 Comprehensive Review.
1030
- 1031 M. Any exceptions to the standards outlined above shall be consistent with the
1032 provisions of the Towson University ART policy, and the specific rationale for
1033 any recommendation involving an exception shall be spelled out in the
1034 appropriate letter of recommendation in the faculty member's evaluation file.
1035
- 1036 N. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided
1037 through annual reviews. The timing of merit evaluations and recommendations
1038 will follow the ART and the CLA PTRM documents as shown in Appendix A.
1039 There are three categories of merit:
1040
- 1041 1. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048

1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083

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

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

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. 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.

In order to clarify which publications count toward merit decisions, the History Merit Subcommittee will consider publications in their merit decisions once that material has been published.

VI. CALENDAR

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

Appendix A

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

1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125

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

All faculty members submit a portfolio to the department chair.

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

B. 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 of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

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 Second Friday in September

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

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 faculty to be added to a department's PTRM 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.

1126

1127 **The Second Friday in October**

1128 A. Department PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty
1129 members are submitted to the department chairperson.

1130 B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been
1131 made.

1132 **The Fourth Friday in October**

1133 A. Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the
1134 first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the
1135 faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

1136 B. The department chairperson will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation
1137 portfolio.

1138 C. The department PTRM committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the
1139 department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

1140

1141 **The Second Friday in November**

1142 The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the department PTRM committee's
1143 written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the
1144 department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTRM chairperson to the dean's
1145 office.

1146 **November 30th**

1147 A. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the
1148 evaluation portfolio.

1149 B. The dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment
1150 recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of
1151 service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified
1152 mail to the faculty member's home.

1153

1154 **The First Friday in December**

1155 Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have
1156 been made.

1157 **The Second Friday in December**

1158 First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the
1159 department chairperson.

1160 **December 15th (USM mandated date)**

1161 Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in
1162 writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

1163

1164 **The First Friday in January**

1165 A. The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-
1166 year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

1167 B. The college PTRM committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty
1168 reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

1169 **The Third Friday in January**

1170 A. The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is
1171 added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

- 1172 B. The college PTRM committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's
1173 recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
1174 C. The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning
1175 reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the
1176 dean.
1177 D. All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty
1178 member to the department chairperson.
1179 E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to
1180 the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

1181
1182 **The First Friday in February**

- 1183 A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the
1184 dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion
1185 and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.
1186 B. The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the
1187 Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare
1188 his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this
1189 recommendation to the summative portfolio.

1190 **The Second Friday in February**

- 1191 A. The dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty
1192 merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall
1193 add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the
1194 negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.
1195 B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an
1196 approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM
1197 committee.
1198 C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the
1199 Provost to the President.

1200
1201 **March 1**

1202 First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the
1203 university President.

1204 **First Friday in March**

1205 Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their
1206 performance toward tenure.

1207 **Third Friday in March**

1208 Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTRM
1209 committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.

1210