

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT,
MERIT AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

(also referred to as the Department’s PTRM Document)

Approved by the Department Faculty: February 11, 2017
Approved by the College of Business and Economics PTRM Committee: February 20, 2017
Approved by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee: March 10, 2017

1
2
3
4

Table of Contents

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE,
REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

INTRODUCTION	3
STATEMENT OF MISSION	3
EVALUATION FOR PURPOSES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION AND MERIT	3
Teaching	4
Scholarship	6
Service	7
STANDARDS FOR MERIT, TENURE AND PROMOTION	7
Standards for Merit Recommendation	7
Standards for Advancement to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	8
Standards for Promotion to Professor	9
Third Year Review	10
Comprehensive Review Five-Year Reviews	11
PROCEDURE AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR ALL REVIEWS (REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, MERIT AND COMPREHENSIVE)	11
PTRM Committee and Rank Committee Membership	11
PTRM Committee Chairperson	12
Confidentiality	12
Quorum and Voting	12
Appeals	13
Annual Approval by the Department	13
Documents Required for Faculty Portfolios	13
DOCUMENT REVIEW AND REVISION	13
CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION/TENURE ACTIONS	13
APPENDIX A: Peer Observation and Review Form	17
APPENDIX B: Evaluation Form for Hybrid/Online courses	18
APPENDIX C: Merit qualifications in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	21

1 **DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT**

2
3 **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE,**
4 **REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

5
6
7 **INTRODUCTION**

8
9 This document describes the standards, procedures, and processes of the Department of
10 Management in reappointment, tenure, promotion, comprehensive review, and merit,
11 under the guidelines set forth in section V of the “University Appointment, Rank and
12 Tenure (ART) Document”. All full-time faculty, tenured, tenure track, lecturer, and
13 visiting, are covered, but the applicability of some items are limited by the terms of
14 appointment.

15
16
17 **STATEMENT OF MISSION**

18
19 The mission of the Department of Management is to provide graduates with the
20 knowledge, skills and attitudes to be effective managers in a variety of organizational
21 settings. We seek to develop graduates with global perspectives, ethical grounding,
22 technological competency and a desire for life-long learning.

23
24
25 **EVALUATION FOR PURPOSES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE,**
26 **PROMOTION AND MERIT**

27
28 The Department of Management requires that faculty hold an earned doctorate in a
29 relevant discipline in order to be considered for tenure. Those individuals not holding an
30 earned doctorate may be appointed to the full-time faculty as lecturers. Regardless of a
31 faculty member’s tenure status or eligibility, the standards for performance review will be
32 based on the departmental workload agreement document (approved by the department,
33 the college and the Provost) submitted by the faculty member in consultation with the
34 chair of the department and Dean of the college. All policies, procedures and processes
35 will be followed in concert with the University Document on Appointment, Rank and
36 Tenure.

37
38 Faculty play a key role in advancing the mission of Towson University. To that end,
39 faculty are chiefly responsible and will be held accountable for the design and delivery of
40 instructional programs in line with Towson’s emphasis on being a learning institution.
41 All faculty are further expected to engage in activities that advance the scholarship of
42 their disciplines as well as in service activities that enhance the teaching/learning mission
43 of the department and college, as well as appropriate professional organizations within
44 their respective disciplines.

1
2 The department recognizes that each faculty member offers a unique combination of
3 education, skills, interests, experiences and career aspirations. Consequently, while the
4 standards for performance will be consistent among faculty, the areas in which each
5 faculty member is evaluated and the weight assigned to each of those areas will differ
6 among faculty, consistent with the annual workload agreements.
7

8 9 **Teaching**

10
11 Student learning is at the core of Towson's mission and therefore represents a primary
12 commitment of the faculty of the department. The teaching component of performance
13 includes actual time spent in the classroom, class preparation time, time spent keeping
14 current in the subject areas being taught, evaluation of student performance, office hours
15 spent counseling students enrolled in the faculty member's courses and time spent
16 advising assigned students from the department's major fields of study. Recognition also
17 extends to supervision of student internships, study abroad, graduate instruction, and
18 directed / independent studies. The expectation is that over time teaching will improve.
19

20 Advising and mentoring students are also critical components of the department's
21 mission to develop students. Each faculty member is expected to assume the duties of
22 advising students. Performance in this area may be determined by the faculty member's
23 ability and willingness to meet students, the development of advising expertise, and
24 student feedback.
25

26 For faculty teaching graduate classes need to be designated as Graduate Faculty.
27

28 Teaching will be evaluated according to the following four components;
29

30 *Instructional Delivery Skills* - this component involves the creation of an overall
31 classroom environment conducive to learning, clarity of communication, enthusiasm, and
32 display of a respectful and caring attitude toward students. Instructional delivery skills
33 are may be assessed using student course evaluation data and classroom visitation.
34

35 *Instructional Design* - this component involves the application of theory to practice,
36 course objectives, the level of rigor and challenge of courses, the selection, scope,
37 sequence and organization of topics, the methods of teaching, and the methods of
38 evaluating student performance. Instructional design may be assessed using a narrative
39 prepared by the faculty member, syllabi, assignments and exams, and student course
40 evaluations.
41

42 *Content expertise* - this component involves the level of subject matter knowledge
43 displayed by the faculty member and the currency of such knowledge. Content expertise
44 may be assessed using a narrative prepared by the faculty member, classroom visitation,

1 faculty writings and presentations, publications related to the scholarship of teaching and
2 participation in continuing education / professional development.

3
4 *Course Management* - this component involves punctuality in meeting class and office
5 hour responsibilities, attendance, prompt grade reporting and accessibility to students
6 enrolled in the faculty member's classes. Course management may be assessed using
7 student course evaluations.

8
9 A variety of means to assess teaching effectiveness are available. Three of the most
10 commonly used methods are peer observation, student evaluations and a teaching
11 narrative.

12
13 *Peer Observation.* Non-tenured faculty members shall be visited twice each academic
14 year by a member of the department's promotion/tenure/reappointment/merit ("PTRM")
15 committee. A member of the PTRM committee shall observe tenured faculty members a
16 minimum of twice every five years. The observation must be scheduled at a day and time
17 convenient for both the faculty member being evaluated and the observer. Prior to any
18 observation, the observer should obtain the course syllabus and confer with the faculty
19 member on the subject being covered that day as well as the pedagogy employed and
20 objectives of the course session. Faculty doing online teaching should provide course
21 access to a peer observer.

22
23 After observing the class for a reasonable period of time, the visitor prepares a peer
24 evaluation form, which must be submitted to the faculty member within one week for
25 inclusion in the faculty member's annual report. The faculty member and observer must
26 each sign the form and the faculty member may prepare a written response to the
27 evaluation. The response should be included in the annual report and a copy provided to
28 the evaluator. A copy of the peer observation form appears in Appendix A.

29
30 Hybrid courses will be evaluated by faculty members with experience or some
31 professional expertise with these delivery methods. A copy of the hybrid/online
32 evaluation form appears in Appendix B.

33
34 Upon the required visitations having been completed, a faculty member may request one
35 additional visitation from either the original visitor or another qualified faculty member,
36 as outlined above. Faculty development is a key objective of the department and faculty
37 who wish to incorporate the feedback received during the initial visitation to improve
38 their current year's performance will be allowed to do so.

39
40 *Student Course Evaluations.* Every faculty member, full and part-time, shall be
41 evaluated by students in all courses, including minimester and summer courses. Faculty
42 will use the teaching evaluation form(s) and processes that have been approved by the
43 department and/or the university. Such evaluations should be commensurate with both
44 the aggregate mean scores for the department's full-time, tenure and tenure-track faculty
45 and those teaching different sections of the same course. Faculty shall calculate and

1 report the average of all items related to the effectiveness of the course and/or instructor.
2 (In the current evaluation form this is 13 items).

3
4 *Teaching Narrative.* A teaching narrative is a comprehensive statement prepared by
5 faculty members describing relevant instructional practices employed in their teaching.
6 Example items that could be included in a narrative are (but not limited to): continuous
7 improvement initiatives, assignments and grading standards, learning outcomes, and
8 technology applications.

9
10 These three evaluation methods- peer observation, student evaluations and teaching
11 narratives- are intended to provide a holistic view of a faculty member's teaching
12 performance.

13 14 15 **Scholarship**

16
17 Scholarship involves the investigation of the significance and meaning of knowledge,
18 undertaken through critical analysis and interpretation. Scholarship may be applied,
19 where knowledge is applied to real world problems to gain an understanding of how the
20 knowledge can be used to help individuals and institutions resolve such problems.
21 Scholarship may be of teaching, where faculty build bridges between their understanding
22 and student learning and results are disseminated to a wider audience. The scholarship of
23 teaching may range from simple critical observation of classroom patterns, to use of
24 classroom data to try out new classroom interventions, to research that compares testing
25 methods to see which best fosters learning. Scholarship may also be that of discovery,
26 where new knowledge is developed through rigorous and disciplined investigative
27 efforts. While the College of Business and Economics' mission is consistent with
28 scholarship that is applied or teaching in nature, scholarship of discovery, while not
29 required, is an appropriate endeavor for faculty who chose to engage in such work.

30
31 The College of Business and Economics expects all full-time faculty members to
32 maintain compliance with the scholarship criteria defined in the CBE PTRM document.
33 However higher levels of performance are necessary for tenure, promotion, annual merit
34 and/or graduate teaching responsibilities or workloads explicitly designed to encourage
35 higher levels of scholarship. Journal rankings such as those provided by the Australian
36 Business Deans' Council may be used as a guide for assessing the quality of a publication
37 outlet.

38
39 With respect to scholarly publications, a two-year period may be considered to
40 compensate for journal acceptance and publication schedules that may result in two or
41 more publications occurring in one year with none in the next

42
43 *Scholarship Narrative.* Faculty members will prepare a statement describing scholarship
44 activities and results for a given year. Examples of scholarly initiatives eligible for
45 inclusion are (but not restricted to): are: manuscript development, peer-reviewed journal

1 publication(s), conference presentations and proceedings, new or substantially revised
2 research book or monograph, a scholarship award, substantial research grant or contract,
3 and a nationally or internationally recognized research fellowship.
4

5 **Service**

6
7 Faculty are expected to contribute their professional expertise to the department, college,
8 university and professional associations. They are encouraged, but not required, to
9 contribute to their communities as well. Faculty service work, both at the University and/
10 professional associations begins with membership and active participation on committees
11 and eventually progresses to leadership roles. Assessment will consider the level and
12 extent of participation and contribution to service endeavors (rather than mere
13 membership) and the collegiality displayed in treating others in a respectful manner. In
14 presenting their service for review, faculty members should prepare a narrative, which
15 explains the scope and depth of their contributions and may also solicit letters of support /
16 reference from those under whom the service was engaged.
17

18 *Service Narrative.* All faculty members will present a narrative of their service
19 contributions with their annual materials. Sample items that may be presented in the
20 service narrative included (but need not be limited to): reviewer of manuscripts for
21 journal or conference, elected member of department or college committee, elected
22 officer for professional organization, discussant at a conference, membership on
23 committee or task force or similar active, working group, chair at a conference, review
24 work for publisher, radio or TV interviews, faculty advisor to student organization, editor
25 of scholarly journal, editorial board of scholarly journal, executive officer of elected
26 committee, service award, elected or appointed member of university committee, elected
27 chair of department or college committee
28

29 30 **STANDARDS FOR MERIT, TENURE AND PROMOTION**

31 32 33 **Standards for Merit Recommendation**

34
35 As stated in the *Appointment, Retention and Tenure (ART) Policy of Towson University*
36 document, sec. IIB1, pp.8-9, all faculty are responsible for complying with University
37 standards and expectations.
38

39 All faculty shall meet the contractual duties of employment including meeting all classes
40 as scheduled, preparing course syllabi, holding office hours for consultation and advising,
41 evaluating student performance, administering course evaluations, participating in the
42 governance of the department, college or university, attending department and college
43 meetings, committing to collegiality and adhering to written policies.
44

1 There are four levels of performance assigned merit ratings over the faculty member's
 2 year of record. For teaching, scholarship and service faculty performance may be judged
 3 as (1) not meeting required standards (unsatisfactory), (2) meeting required standards
 4 (acceptable) (3) exceeding required standards (meritorious) and (4) significantly
 5 exceeding required standards (outstanding). A thorough assessment based on a
 6 preponderance of evidence presented in a faculty member's annual report should direct
 7 the PTRM committee to an appropriate determination of performance level.

8
 9 A recommendation for **unsatisfactory** is given for faculty members who have not met
 10 minimum expectations in any of the three areas Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. A
 11 recommendation of **acceptable** requires that the faculty member meet expectations in **all**
 12 **three performance areas**. A recommendation for **base merit** requires 1. the faculty
 13 member demonstrate **strong teaching** (consistent with the importance of teaching in the
 14 mission of the university, college and department) along with meritorious performance in
 15 either research or service and 3. demonstrate **excellence in either scholarship or**
 16 **service**. These set of standards is illustrated in the following figure:

Base Merit			
Teaching	meritorious		
Scholarship	acceptable <i>or</i> meritorious	}	<i>One of these two areas must be meritorious; the other must be acceptable</i>
Service	acceptable <i>or</i> meritorious		
Base-Plus Merit			
Teaching	outstanding		
Scholarship	meritorious <i>or</i> outstanding	}	<i>One of these two areas must be outstanding; the other must be meritorious</i>
Service	meritorious <i>or</i> outstanding		

27
 28
 29 Appendix C outlines a basic framework for defining faculty performance outcomes.

30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40 **Standards for Advancement to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

41
 42 Faculty members seeking advancement to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
 43 should demonstrate significant contributions in each of the three critical areas; teaching,
 44 scholarship and service.

1 Teaching

2
3 There should be consistently satisfactory or excellent performance in teaching as
4 demonstrated through previously outlined elements (i.e. peer observations, student
5 evaluations and a teaching portfolio).

6
7 Scholarship

8
9 Faculty are expected to go beyond the CBE standard for a minimum level of peer-
10 reviewed journal articles (3-4) in respectable outlets with consideration given to sole and
11 lead authorship and the, quality of submission outlet. There should also be evidence of
12 continuing scholarly progress.

13
14 Service

15
16 For advancement to tenure and promotion there should be a record of contributions to the
17 department and college. Contributions may take the form of active membership on
18 committees or task forces, representing the department or college in university events,
19 and serving as an advisor for student organizations. Professional and community service
20 are also favorably recognized. Faculty are also acknowledged for promoting an
21 atmosphere of respect and civility.

22
23
24 **Standards for Promotion to Professor**

25
26 Associate professors applying for advancement to Professor should meet comparable
27 requirements for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor in terms of teaching,
28 scholarship and service as set forth under Standards for Advancement to Tenure and
29 Promotion to Associate Professor. These standards will be applied to performance
30 demonstrated after promotion to Associate Professor. The appointee shall have a
31 minimum of ten years of full-time university/college teaching experience.

32
33 Teaching

34
35 There should be consistently satisfactory or excellent performance in teaching as
36 demonstrated through previously outlined elements (i.e. peer observations, student
37 evaluations and a teaching portfolio).

38
39 Scholarship

40
41 Faculty are expected to go beyond the CBE standard for a minimum level of peer-
42 reviewed journal articles (3-4) in respectable outlets with consideration given to sole and
43 lead authorship and the quality of submission outlet. There should also be evidence of
44 continuing scholarly progress.

1 Service

2
3 Candidates for Professor should present a record of contributions to the department and
4 college. In addition to a record of active involvement, candidates should also
5 demonstrate evidence of service leadership. Professional and community service are also
6 favorably recognized. Faculty are also acknowledged for promoting an atmosphere of
7 respect and civility.

8
9 Candidates for Professor, as representatives of the department, college and university are
10 also expected to:

- 11
12 • Possess a national reputation or expertise affirmed through the recognition of their
13 work.
14 • Share in responsibility for mentoring junior faculty.

15
16
17 **Third-Year Review**

18
19 The department PTRM committee shall conduct a Third-Review of tenure-track
20 candidates as called for in Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment,
21 Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (sec. III.D.5). This process includes:

- 22
23 • A portfolio prepared by the faculty member to be reviewed. This portfolio will
24 present documentation related to the faculty member’s contributions for the first
25 two years of his/her service.
26
27 • An evaluation of the portfolio by the department PTRM committee including a
28 statement about the faculty member’s performance relative and with an
29 assessment about the progress toward tenure and promotion.
30
31 • Completion of this review by the third Friday in January. Documentation is sent
32 to the department chair.
33
34 • Sharing the results of this review, in writing and in a meeting between the
35 candidate, department chair and PTRM chair no later than the first Friday in
36 March.
37
38 • Sharing the results of this review with the college Dean but not with the college
39 PTRM committee or with the Provost.

40
41 **Comprehensive Five-Year Reviews**

1 All tenured faculty members shall be reviewed every five years in accordance with the
2 processes outlined in Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment,
3 Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (sec. III.D.7). In particular these reviews require:
4

- 5 • Preparation of a comprehensive review portfolio as outlined in Section I.B.3.d.
6
- 7 • A statement outlining goals and expected career development plans for the
8 upcoming 5 year period.
9
- 10
- 11 • The department PTRM committee assess the candidate's performance relative to
12 the department's standards in each critical performance category (teaching,
13 scholarship, service). The committee's review is to be submitted to the
14 department chair by the second Friday in October.
15
- 16 • The department chair prepares an independent, written evaluation.
17
- 18 • The PTRM committee's evaluation, its vote count and department chair's
19 evaluation are to be given to the candidate by the fourth Friday in October.
20

21

22 **PROCEDURE AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP FOR ALL REVIEWS**
23 **(REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, MERIT AND**
24 **COMPREHENSIVE)**
25

26 **PTRM Committee and Rank Committee Membership**
27

28 The PRTM Committee shall make recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and merit
29 for all department faculty. All tenured faculty members of the department are members of
30 the PTRM Committee.
31

32 In the event a committee has fewer than three members within the department, additional
33 tenured faculty from other college departments shall be included. The additional tenured
34 faculty members shall be selected from a list of at least three (3) faculty members
35 recommended by the faculty member under review. This list must be submitted by on or
36 before the third Friday in June. The dean and department chair shall review the list and
37 make a recommendation by the first Friday in September. The college PTRM committee
38 will then select the additional faculty member(s) on or before the third Friday in
39 September.
40

41 The Rank Committee shall make recommendations for promotion and conduct
42 comprehensive reviews in accordance with the ART document. All tenured and tenure-
43 track faculty members who have served at least three years at the University and who

1 hold higher rank than the person to be evaluated are members of the person's Rank
2 Committee for promotional decisions.

3
4 The Rank Committee for comprehensive review shall also include faculty members at the
5 same rank as the faculty member under review, provided they also are tenured or tenure-
6 track.

7
8 In the event a committee has fewer than three members within the department, the
9 chairperson of the PTRM Committee will request the CBE Promotions and Tenure
10 Committee to appoint as many additional faculty members from other departments in
11 CBE as are needed to bring the total to three. The appointed members must otherwise
12 meet the qualification of committee membership required of a departmental faculty
13 member.

14 15 16 **PTRM Committee Chairperson**

17
18 By the first Friday in May, the PTRM Committee will elect a chairperson by majority
19 vote. The chairperson will organize and schedule deliberations in accordance with the
20 published PTRM schedule. The committee chair will report, in writing, the results of all
21 votes to the candidates as well as to the next level of deliberation, the College PTRM
22 Committee. The department chair serves as a nonvoting member of the committee.

23
24 The committee chair will submit written reports of final votes to candidates. The
25 chairperson of the PTRM Committee is responsible for the security of all files and for the
26 inclusion of all decisional documents. A detailed summary of tenure and rank decisions
27 with complete justification must be included in the materials transmitted to the CBE
28 PTRM Committee.

29 30 31 **Confidentiality**

32
33 All department committee deliberations will be conducted under strict confidentiality.

34 35 36 **Quorum and Voting**

37
38 Two-thirds of committee members must be present to call a vote on any recommendation.
39 Proxy or absentee votes are not permitted. Each committee member receives one equal
40 vote. A majority of favorable votes of those cast is necessary for a favorable
41 recommendation. Tie votes are not considered majority and will be reported as such to
42 the next level of review, the College PTRM Committee. Abstentions are not permitted
43 except as permitted by the ART document. Faculty members on sabbatical or other leave
44 may vote on all matters in department business, including tenure, promotion and merit
45 recommendations provided they have reviewed material to be considered and are present

1 for deliberations. If they chose not to participate, the number of the electorate for quorum
2 purposes shall be reduced accordingly. Meetings are to be conducted in accordance with
3 Robert's Rules of Order.

4
5 All votes will be conducted by a balloting process described in Appendix 3, Sec III.A.5
6 of the ART document. Each committee member records a vote on a ballot then signs,
7 dates and includes his/her university ID number. The ballots are then transferred to the
8 Provost's office.

9
10 Recommendations for tenure and advancement to associate professor shall be made
11 concurrently. A positive recommendation for one decision must be accompanied by a
12 positive recommendation for the other.

13 14 **Appeals**

15
16 Department recommendations may be appealed to the College of Business and
17 Economics PTRM committee, subject to the protocols established in the CBE PTRM
18 document and the ART document.

19 20 21 **Documents Required for Faculty Portfolios**

22
23 Faculty members must comply with the requirements for the content and format of their
24 portfolio materials. These requirements are especially critical for portfolios considered
25 for tenure, promotion, third-year and comprehensive reviews.

26 27 28 **DOCUMENT REVIEW AND REVISION**

29
30 This document is subject to review by the department every three years. All proposed
31 changes are subject to the approval of the CBE and University PTRM committees. All
32 tenure and tenure-track department members are eligible to participate and vote on
33 proposed revisions.

34 35 36 **CALENDAR FOR PROMOTION/TENURE ACTIONS**

37
38 The department shall adhere to the schedule for all promotion, tenure, reappointment and
39 merit actions as outlined in the current ART document (currently section VI).

40
41 *First Friday in May*

42
43 Department committees are formed.

44
45 *Third Friday in June*

1
2 All of the following documents are due and must be submitted to the department
3 chairperson or designee(s):
4

- 5 • Faculty Annual Report (AR) or Chairperson’s Annual Report (CAR).
- 6 • Current professional curriculum vitae
- 7 • Syllabus for each course currently taught
- 8 • Evaluation of teaching and advising
- 9 • Other documents required in Section II.B or desired by faculty member

10
11 Faculty seeking advancement to tenure and or rank promotions during the next
12 academic year should notify the department chair.
13

14 *First Friday in September*

15
16 Tenure/promotion/comprehensive review portfolios are due to the PTRM committee
17 chair.
18

19 *Third Friday in September*

20
21 Faculty may add information to update their files for work completed before June 1st.
22

23 First Year Probationary Faculty members have met with department chairpersons to
24 complete the Statement on Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-track Faculty
25 (SENTF) form.
26

27 *Second Friday in October*

28
29 Department PTRM Committee(s)’ recommendations given to all nonfirst year faculty.
30

31 *Fourth Tuesday in November*

32
33 All faculty recommendations delivered to the College PTRM Committee.
34

35 *First Friday in December*

36
37 Department PTRM documents, with the approval forms, shall be submitted to the
38 CBE PTRM Committee by the first Friday in December
39

40 *December 15 (This deadline is mandated by the USM.)*

41
42 Tenure-track faculty in the second or any subsequent year of the probationary period
43 must be notified in writing of reappointment or non-reappointment for the next
44 academic year.

1
2 *Third Friday in January*

3
4 Department recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year
5 tenure-track faculty delivered to the faculty member and the Dean. Faculty may
6 appeal to the college PTRM Committee.

7
8 All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the
9 faculty member to the department chairperson.

10
11 Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be
12 added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

13
14 *First Friday in February*

15
16 The Dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the
17 Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning
18 promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

19
20 The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment
21 to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the Dean
22 shall prepare his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and
23 add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

24
25 *Second Friday in February*

26
27 The Dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for
28 faculty merit to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the department
29 recommendation, the Dean shall add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's
30 evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or by certified mail to
31 the faculty member's home.

32
33 Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with
34 an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the
35 university PTRM committee.

36
37 Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from
38 the Provost to the President.

39
40 *March 1*

41
42 First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from
43 the university President.

44
45 *First Friday in March*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

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

Third Friday in March

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

APPENDIX A
Peer Observation and Review Form

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Faculty Member Visited: _____

Visited by: _____ Date: _____

Course Title and Number: _____

I. Course Content:

II. Pedagogy:

III. Class Conduct.

Signed: _____ evaluator

Signed: (Read and understood) _____ instructor

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Form for Hybrid/Online courses

COURSE: _____ **EVALUATOR:** _____

SEMESTER: _____ **DATES of OBSERVATION:** _____

FACULTY: _____

OUTSTANDING Performance clearly exceeded standards	COMMENDABLE Performance consistently met and sometimes exceeded standards	FULLY EFFECTIVE Performance consistently met standards	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT Performance was inconsistent in meeting standards	UNSATISFACTORY Performance did not fulfill standards	NOT OBSERVED
5	4	3	2	1	0

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Knowledge of Subject

- instructor showed mastery & currency of course content/knowledgeable of subject matter
- course materials (i.e., text presentations, websites, lecture notes, simulation, and multimedia) are appropriate for the level of the course
- course materials and assignments provide depth sufficient for the learners to achieve the course objectives.
- connection was made between material in lecture and lab/ online exercises.

19
20

RATING: _____

21
22
23
24
25
26
27

COMMENTS:

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Organization of the Class

- course content presented in an organized and logical manner
- course site(s) easy to navigate
- course content supports course objectives
- the learning modules (chapters, units, weekly content) are consistent in design
- policy states the time frame for responding to student emails, assignment submission and student inquires
- deadlines and dates are clearly stated, readily accessible and accurate
- important course documents are readily accessible
- Syllabus provides course information and policies in a structured, informative, logical, and organized manner.
- guidelines and expectations for student participation are clearly articulated

40
41

RATING: _____

42
43
44
45
46

COMMENTS:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Effectiveness of Presentation

- Relevant and helpful examples were provided, if necessary
- Course content presented in a clear and understandable manner
- Appropriate available communication tools utilized (announcements, calendar, email, etc.)
- Appropriate assessment strategies / instruments utilized

RATING: _____

COMMENTS:

Learning Environment

- faculty exhibits professionalism
- tone of course materials & communication encourages learning

RATING: _____

COMMENTS:

Overall Effectiveness

RATING: _____

COMMENTS:

Evaluator

Date

Faculty Member

Date

48
49
50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

APPENDIX C

Merit qualifications in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

The accomplishments listed in each category apply to the assessment of faculty member’s merit performance. These items are examples of what is commonly cited or understood to represent performance levels for each dimension of faculty workload. Determination for a faculty member’s performance in a particular area is based on consideration of the preponderance of all the evidence presented by the faculty, or otherwise available, to the PTRM committee.

AREA OF PERFORMANCE

LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE	TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not meeting classes• Course syllabi do not conform with department course consistency document.• Not holding office hours• Not evaluating student performance through acceptable instruments• Not meeting with and advising students• Unprofessional conduct• Excessive absenteeism, tardiness or early dismissals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No evidence of scholarly activity• Unethical scholarly conduct (e.g. plagiarism, falsification of data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not attending department or CBE meetings (unless excused by the department chair)

Acceptable

- Meeting classes
- Preparing course syllabi according to required standards
- Holding regular office hours
- Evaluating student performance through acceptable instrument
- Meeting with and advising students
- Evidence of scholarly activity
- Attending department and CBE meetings (unless excused by the department chair)
- Attending university commencement

Meritorious

- Receiving “good” teaching evaluation ratings from both students (typically a median value of 4.0 on two or more items for most courses taught in the year OR 3.0 or higher for online, hybrid or graduate courses)
- Peer evaluation showing good teaching performance
- Showing flexibility in accepting course workloads that include new topics, areas, and course formats; including graduate teaching, new course preps, online/hybrid course sections and off-site venues
- Leading a study abroad course.
- Taking on substantial extra teaching duties such as independent studies, directed readings, special topics, and management internships
- Peer-reviewed conference presentation
- Published chapter(s) in edited book
- Published teaching cases and exercises
- Published review of books, software, etc. in scholarly journal
- Published textbook-supporting materials
- Licensed computer software
- Non-monetary research contracts
- Reviewer of manuscripts for journal or conference
- Active member of department or college committee
- Discussant at a conference
- Membership on committee or task force or similar active, working group
- Chair of a session at a conference
- Review work for publisher
- Radio or TV interviews, Op-ed letters, etc.
- Conducting workshops (on- or off-campus)

- Introducing innovative pedagogies (e.g. technology)

Outstanding

- Winning a teaching grant or award
- Presentation on improving teaching at a conference
- Peer evaluation showing strong teaching performance
- Consistently high teaching evaluation ratings from students (typically a median value of 5 on 2 or more key assessment items for most courses taught in the year OR 4.0 for online, hybrid or graduate courses)
- Nationally or internationally-recognized teaching fellowship
- Peer-reviewed journal publication(s). (either one in the year of review or two averaged over a two year period).
- New or substantially revised research book or monograph
- Scholarship award
- Substantial research grant or contract
- Nationally or internationally-recognized research fellowship
- Editor of scholarly journal
- Editorial board of scholarly journal
- Service award
- Faculty advisor to student organization
- Active leader of department, college or university committee
- Leadership role in a professional organization.
- Active officer or board member of professional organization.
- Conducting professional workshops

1
2
3