

The College of Business And Economics

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Procedures and Standards

Prepared: May, 1985
Adopted: May, 1985
Revised: March, 1990
Revised: April, 1990
Approved: April 15, 1993
Revised: December, 1995
Approved: January, 1996
Revised: October, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Composition..... | 3 |
| 2. Election, Eligibility, Term | 3 |
| 3. Administrative Duties/Procedures | 4 |
| 4. Evaluation Procedures..... | 5 |
| 5. Standards for Evaluation | 6 |
| 6. Confidentiality..... | 10 |
| 7. Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Notification | 11 |
| 8. Standards for Merit Recommendation | 11 |
| 9. Materials Required for Submission by Departments and Faculty Candidates | 13 |
| 10. Appeal Procedures..... | 16 |

Terms of members of the CBE PTRM Committee shall be staggered among departments to prevent the necessity of electing a completely new committee in any year.

The Committee, at the first meeting of the academic year, shall elect its own chairperson and secretary who will serve for a term of one year.

Administrative Duties/Procedures

- a. The CBE PTRM Committee shall appoint tenured faculty members from other departments within the CBE to serve on tenure, rank, and comprehensive review committees in cases when a department does not have three members at the appropriate rank. The additional tenured faculty members shall be selected by the CBE PTRM Committee from a list of named individuals submitted by the faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The faculty member shall submit the list of named individuals on or before the third Friday in June. The department chairperson and the Dean shall review the list and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The CBE PTRM Committee will select the additional faculty member(s) to be added to the Committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.
- b. The Committee shall develop a PTRM document that adheres to the university standards, criteria, and/or expectations pertaining to annual review, reappointments, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review. Each college shall develop its own specific standards and expectations. These must be accompanied by clear criteria for evaluation and must not conflict with those established by the university. The process shall include:

The CBE PTRM document pertaining to standards, criteria, and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the CBE PTRM Committee. The CBE PTRM document must be distributed to all tenured and tenure track faculty in the CBE for input at least 10 business days prior to the CBE PTRM Committee vote on the documents. Final approval shall be by a simple majority vote of CBE tenured/tenure track faculty. Except for faculty who are on sabbatical or leave from the university, the signature of each tenured or tenured track faculty member will signify that he/she has voted on the

Committee and submit a clean copy by the due date specified by the University PTRM Committee. Once the University PTRM Committee has approved the CBE PTRM document, it will forward a copy of the approved document to the CBE Dean.

The Dean of the CBE shall be responsible for assuring that the approved CBE PTRM documents are posted on the Towson University website.

- c. All policies at the college level shall remain in effect until changes according to the procedures described herein. However, faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the College PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they are first appointed to a tenure track position.
- d. Beginning with the AY 2011-12, the CBE PTRM Committee shall review its document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CBE Dean and to the University PTRM Committee.
- e. Revisions to department PTRM documents are to be approved by the CBE PTRM Committee and the Dean of the College prior to submission to the University PTRM Committee. Revised department PTRM documents, with the approval forms, shall be submitted to the CBE PTRM Committee by the first Friday in December. Each department shall develop its own specific standards and expectations with clear criteria for evaluation, ensuring that they are not in conflict with those established by the university and/or college. Following approval by the CBE PTRM Committee, the documents shall be submitted to the University PTRM Committee. Following approval by the University PTRM Committee, the documents shall be posted on the Towson University website.

The CBE PTRM Committee shall examine the materials submitted by each department for faculty recommended for promotion and/or tenure and shall decide whether to support or deny the recommendations. Information used for the decision are teaching performance; academic training and earned degrees; scholarship, especially publications in peer-reviewed journals, external grants and contracts; and service to the department, college, university, and community. The decisions should be consistent with the Faculty Handbook, CBE mission, standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship and service as outlined in this document, collegiality issues, and any other areas pertinent to the decision.

The Dean and department chairs shall submit written independent recommendations of the department chair shall serve as a non-voting member of the department PTRM committee(s). The recommendations should not only be communicated to the Provost, but also to the CBE Dean, the department chairperson, the CBE PTRM committee chairperson, and the faculty candidate.

d. Voting. During meetings of the full CBE PTRM Committee, subject to the quorum conditions above, a vote shall be taken on each departmental recommendation. This vote shall be considered final if a majority of the members present for the deliberations agree. There will be no tie votes. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit and/or comprehensive five-year reviews taken by the Committee shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member and tallied by the Committee chair. No Committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

Standards for Evaluation

a. Teaching and Advising

Teaching takes a variety of forms, including but not limited to, the use of technology or classroom-based research to improve teaching, the development of new courses and programs, faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, and involvement in online learning.

The primary purposes of faculty academic advising are to assist students in the development of meaningful educational and career plans that are compatible with their life goals. Faculty advising can also take the form of mentoring colleagues in effective teaching or academic advising as well as mentoring student scholarship (e.g. independent study projects or theses).

1) Evaluation of teaching by students: student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. Such an evaluation is one kind of assessment and should be

2) *Evaluation of teaching by peers*: classroom visits are encouraged for the purposes of professional growth and are required when the faculty member is being considered for rank advancement, tenure, comprehensive five- year review, three-year review or reappointment. A minimum of two peer observations shall be conducted per review period. The department PTRM Committee will approve the peers selected for the review. Advance notice of at least one week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.

3). *Self-evaluation* of teaching and/or advising effectiveness by faculty being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure, three-year reviews, or comprehensive five-year reviews, shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.

4). *Developmental plan*: in the event that a faculty member has consistently unsatisfactory student or peer evaluations of instruction, the department chairperson shall generate a developmental plan in consultation with the faculty member. The plan may include mentoring, additional classroom visitations, participation in appropriate university and college developmental workshops, and/or counseling for improvement of teaching effectiveness. A plan shall be developed regardless of the rank and/or tenure status of the faculty.

Standards for Tenure and Rank Advancement to Associate Professor

Outstanding instruction as measured by student evaluations.

Effective instruction as measured by an exemplary peer evaluation for each year of the most recent five-year period.

Effective advising as measured by availability to students, accuracy of advice given to students and knowledge about programs, policies, procedures, and career opportunities.

The following additional evidence may be submitted to support evidence of excellence in teaching:

If applicable, maintaining currency of licensure, certification and accreditation

Reflection and growth in teaching methodology

Mentoring student scholarship

Having met contractual obligations for approved off-campus activities such as

international teaching exchanges

TJETf EMC 21 0 n1 0 0 1(int)-3(e)4(rna)7(ti)(8n)-e reW23-9(e)4(x)

Effective advising as measured by availability to students, accuracy in advice given to students and knowledge about programs, policies procedures and career opportunities.

The following additional evidence may be submitted to support evidence of excellence in teaching:

Unsolicited evaluations of instruction by both current students and graduates

Reflection and growth in teaching methodology

International teaching exchange, sabbatical or consulting contracts

University instructional development grants

If applicable, maintaining the currency of licensure, certification and accreditation

Mentoring student scholarship

Mentoring colleagues in effective teaching and academic advising

Teaching awards

b. Scholarship

Scholarship is widely interpreted and may take many forms, including, but not limited to, publications, presentations, or grants. Faculty conduct their scholarship in the development of new or the extension of existing knowledge. Other faculty engage in research that is applied, finding new ways to use knowledge for practical purposes, including pedagogy and published case studies. Faculty also engage in developing and publishing software for classroom uses. Interdisciplinary efforts where faculty work to expand their knowledge and apply it in new ways constitute yet another form of applied scholarship.

Expected scholarship standards include the following:

Tenure and Rank Advancement to Associate Professor: Faculty applying for tenure

Other evidence of scholarship, including, but not limited to, peer-reviewed published proceedings or paper presentations at academic conferences, or published software, are expected of all faculty but may be waived with superior number and/or quality of published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed journal articles.

Tenure and rank advancement decisions will normally be made concurrently; i.e., they are mutually inclusive and no favorable recommendation will normally go forward without having satisfied both decisions.

Rank Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor: Faculty should have a **sustained** record of conducting and reporting research **with a distinction in the quality** Professor should meet the following minimum criteria in the most recent five-year period:

Three to four published (or forthcoming) peer-reviewed articles in quality journals as recognized by published reputable sources to provide information that would establish whether their publications are in quality journals. Information such as journal rankings, acceptance rates, number of citations received, and external letters of support are examples of information that would help

- Uuwckpgf 'lpxqrkgo gpv'lp'vj g'y qtm'qh'r tcevkqpgtu'lp'qpgau'hgrf "g'd 0' presentations at various events in the community, state, regional and other markets; maintaining civic duties by serving various community needs; creating additional opportunities through personal initiatives such as internships or networking venues).
- Eqvtdwvqpu'q'r tcevkqpgtu'cpf "eqo o wplv' 'vj cv'f tcy "w' qp"qpgau" professional expertise (e.g. professional consulting).
- Uuwckpgf 'lpxqrkgo gpv'lp'r tqhgu'kqpcn'qti cpl'k'v'qpu'cpf "cuuqek'v'qpu'lp'qpgau'hgrf" field at local, state, regional and national and/or international levels (e.g. committee membership in professional organizations; participation in regional and national academic societies as paper reviewers or discussants, session or track chairs; and membership on the editorial boards of a peer reviewed journal).

Standard for Rank Advancement to Professor:

Leadership positions and **distinction in the quality** qh'qpgau'ugt'x'legu'v'q'vj g" institution at the program, department, college, university or system levels (e.g., Faculty Senate; chairperson positions on faculty or ad hoc committees and in the university governance structure; chairperson for new faculty searches). Membership on a committee(s) is not sufficient evidence.

Sustained involvement lp'r tqhgu'kqpcn'qti cpl'k'v'qpu'cpf "cuuqek'v'qpu'lp'qpgau'hgrf" at the state, regional and/or national levels (e.g., leadership in professional organizations, societies, and associations; committee membership in professional organizations; academic conference program chairs; significant editorial responsibilities of a peer-

Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Notification

Promotion and/or tenure recommendations and decisions on merit appeals by the CBE PTRM Committee shall be summarized in a letter from the chair of the Committee to each of the faculty members involved in the decisions. Copies of each letter shall be provided to the department chairs, chairs of the respective department PTRM Committees, and the College Dean. A record of the vote count shall be forwarded with the cand

MERITORIOUS (Performance is noteworthy and exceeds expectations)

In addition to meeting the contractual duties of employment, a *meritorious* judgment shall be recommended when the faculty is deemed meritorious in teaching and one other category (research or service) and a judgment of acceptable in the third category.

A rating of meritorious shall mean at the minimum that (a) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as acknowledged in the sources of evidence appropriate to an annual review, and in addition, (b) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly work through the annual report, whether that work has been published, or is pending publication, or constitutes other forms of intellectual contributions (e.g., peer-reviewed conference paper presentations, recipient of a research grant from an external agency or substantial editorial responsibilities for a quality peer-reviewed journal), or reflects evidence of significant manuscript development, and/ or (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service to either the University, the community or the profession.

Departments shall establish meritorious standards that recognize noteworthy faculty performances in teaching, scholarship and service.

OUTSTANDING- (Performance is truly exceptional)

In addition to meeting the contractual duties of employment, an *outstanding* judgment shall be recommended when the faculty is deemed outstanding in teaching and one other area. The third area must be rated acceptable at a minimum.

Departments shall establish exemplary standards that recognize superior faculty performances in teaching, scholarship and service.

Materials Required for Submission by Departments and Faculty Candidates

a. Materials Required from Departments

The department should provide all working documents approved by the University PTRM Committee under which the department currently operates.

The department should provide the CBE PTRM Chair with a summary spreadsheet report that includes the following information:

A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for promotion by professorial rank.

A list of names of all faculty candidates recommended for tenure.

A list of all faculty members recommended for non-reappointment

Section V:

Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Written recommendation of the department rank comm-T/e dee/or[)TJETQq0.00000

If an administrator participating in the evaluation process includes information in the

TOWSON UNIVERSITY ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, THIRD-YEAR REVIEW, MERIT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW CALENDAR (ALL DEADLINES ARE FINAL DEADLINES)

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 an evaluation 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.

December 15th (USM mandated date)

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

The First Friday in January

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

B. The CBE PTRM Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the Dean.

The Third Friday in January

C0Vj g'F gcpau'y tkwgp'gxcnckqp'tgi ctf kpi 'r tqo qvqp'cpf lqt tenure with recommendation is added vq'yj g'hcwmm'o go dgtau'gxcnckqp'r qt vhrkq0'

D0Vj g'eqmgi g'RVTO "eqo o kwggau'tgr qt v'y kj "xqvq'eqwpu'cpf 'tgeqo o gpf cvkqpu'cpf "yj g'F gcpau" recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

C. The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.

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

E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the hcwmm'o go dgtau'gxcnckqp'r qt vhrkq0'

The First Friday in February

A. The college Dean forwards the summative portfqrk'lpenuk'g'qh'yj g'eqo o kwggau'cpf "yj g'F gcpau" recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

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

The Second Friday in February

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

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

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

March 1

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

First Friday in March

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