

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

PTRM PROCEDURES

May 2011

	Page
I. COMPOSITIONS OF THE COMMITTEES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	2
1. Rank committee membership and duties	2
2. Tenure committee membership and duties	2
3. Duties of PTRM Committee Chair	3
4. Role of Department Chairperson	4
5. Merit committee membership and duties	4
II. PROCEDURES	5
1. Meetings	5
2. Voting	5
3. Peer review	6
4. Appeal	6
5. Documents required	6
6. Evaluation of teaching by peers and students	8
III. REAPPOINTMENT	9
IV. TENURE AND PROMOTION	9
V. DEPARTMENT MERIT AND ANNUAL REVIEW	11
VI. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW	12
VII. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW	13
IX. CALENDAR	14
APPENDICES	
A. Department's PTRM Criteria Guideline	17
B. GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS	21

The criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion and merit evaluation are given in the faculty handbook and specifically stated in the Department's PTRM Criteria Guideline (See Appendix A). The detailed instructions on how to prepare dossiers are given in the department's "Guidelines for Preparation of Dossiers" (See Appendix B). Please also read the University faculty handbook and the FCSM PTRM policies, procedures, criteria and standards for details. The following sections are devoted to the committee memberships, procedures, policies and important dates in the process of PTRM.

I. COMPOSITIONS OF THE COMMITTEES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

I.1. Rank Committee Membership and Duties

The Department follows the standard procedure: Rank Committees are composed of the members of the Department who hold higher academic rank than the person to be evaluated. The rank committee for promotion to associate professor includes all associate and full professors. The rank committee for promotion to full professor includes all full professors.

Duties of the Rank Committee

- a. Decide on recommendation for promotion for faculty members who applied.
- b. Perform any duties related to rank which may be assigned by the University and College PTRM

Committees.

- c. Review the available folder containing all documents assembled by the reviewee.
- d. Each member should review the folders.

I.2. Tenure Committee Membership and Duties

The Tenure Committee consists of all members of the department who have tenure. The Department Chairperson will appoint the PTRM Chairperson who must be both a member of the Rank Committee and the Tenure Committee, and who will be the chairperson for both of these committees.

Duties of the Tenure Committee

- a. To evaluate each tenure and tenure-track faculty member

- and make recommendations for tenure and/or reappointment.
- b. Each member should review the folders containing documents prepared by the reviewee and reviewer.
- c. Members may be asked to serve as reviewer for a non-tenured faculty for reappointment/tenure discussion.
- d. Update and modify the departmental PTRM documents

I.3. The duties of the PTRM Committee Chair

- a. Keep members of the department informed of the PTRM process, including:
 - . any changes in university or college policies and procedures, and deadlines;
 - . departmental policies, procedures, deadlines, schedules, etc.;
 - . tabulation of departmental recommendations, and their resolution.
- b. Determine the mechanics and maintain the files for systematically gathering data (classroom visitations, student questionnaires, promotional data folders, etc.).
- c. Be responsible for physically securing the records, and making them available to committee members.
- d. Act as liaison between the Rank/Tenure Committee, the department members, the College PTRM Committee, the University PTRM Committee, and any other authorized concerned group.
- e. Perform other duties which the Rank/Tenure Committee may from year to year wish to delegate to the Chairperson.
- f. Responsibilities in Promotion:

The PTRM Chairperson shall be specifically responsible for coordinating the departmental promotional evaluation process by:

 - . making sure needed forms and other materials are available;
 - . coordinating efforts of the department members, the Rank Committee, and other university bodies;
 - . preparing the agenda and calling meetings of the Rank Committee;
 - . helping to assure that the Rank Committee and the department meet promotional process deadlines.
- g. Responsibilities in Tenure:

The PTRM Chairperson shall be specifically responsible for coordinating the department tenure evaluation process by:

- . being aware of who the non-tenured faculty are and helping assure that the Tenure Committee meet tenure process deadlines,
- . coordinating faculty classroom visits of non-tenured faculty,
- . making sure needed forms and other materials (files of non-tenured faculty) are available,
- . preparing the agenda and calling meetings of the Tenure Committee (except the first meeting of each academic year which is to be called by the Department Chairperson),
- . developing and/or updating each non-tenured faculty member's Tenure Calendar Form,
- . preparing a progress report during April of each year outlining the strengths and weaknesses in performance of each probationary appointee as perceived by members of the Tenure Committee,

h. Responsibilities in Reappointment:

The PTRM Chairperson shall be specifically responsible for producing, as recommended by the Tenure Committee, a timely recommendation as to the renewal of each probationary faculty member's contract and to forward the recommendation(s) to the Dean.

I.4. Role of Department Chairperson

The chairperson serves as both an administrator and faculty member, occupying a unique blended position in the department. The chairperson serves as a non-voting member on the rank committee, merit committee and tenure committee. The primary role of the chairperson is to lead faculty and staff colleagues in the department to create an effective and efficient learning organization by

- ensuring that the needs of the students in the programs supported by the department and the general education courses delivered by the department are fully met.
- ensuring continual professional and personal growth of departmental colleagues.
- ensuring active research programs in the department and providing role models for new faculty members
- fostering appropriate change and planning.

- promoting scholarship for advancement of the discipline(s).
- being an advocate for the academic mission, values, and needs of the department, college, and University.
- maintaining and overseeing the standards for completion of program requirements toward graduation.

The chairperson is expected to integrate faculty and administrative functions, engaging in leadership, management, teaching, scholarship and service activities, toward the creation of an effective and efficient academic unit. See Towson Faculty Handbook for more details.

I.5. Merit Committee Membership and Duties

The Merit Committee for merit evaluation includes all full professors.

Duties of Merit Committee

- a. Decide on a yearly recommendation concerning departmental merit for each faculty member of the department.
- b. Review the annual report and the folder containing all document assembled by faculty members
- c. discuss the performance of the faculty member
- d. compare the faculty member's performance with others in the department
- e. discuss the activity, effort, accomplishments
- f. Following the discussion of a faculty member's performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the faculty member's performance will be rated.

II. PROCEDURES

II.1 Meetings

- Robert's Rules of Order will be followed in all meetings in those situations not covered by this document.
- Seventy five percent (75)% of the eligible members of the committee must be present for a quorum. Those members who are on sabbatical or on leave are not counted for a quorum. However, they may attend and vote, if they desire.
- All tenured committee members shall be informed well in advance of the meetings, including those on sabbatical or on leave. Notification shall be done by an appropriate means to ensure that it is received in a timely manner.

II.2.Voting Procedure

The following voting procedure will be followed for reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit evaluation. All deliberations pertaining to annual faculty evaluations, reappointment, merit, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review shall be confidential.

- a. Decisions will be made by the eligible members of the Rank/Tenure Committee or Rank Subcommittee. All voting shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. All decisions made by the committee must be made by a quorum of at least seventy five percent of eligible members; the outcome will be decided by the majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed again by the entire committee and voted on a second time. This procedure will continue until the tie vote is broken. The committee shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the *next level of review*. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.
- b. A vote will be considered to be decisive (conclusive) when the motions supported by a simple majority of the eligible members present.
- c. Votes will be counted immediately by the PTRM Chairperson in the presence of the Department Chairperson and one other member of the Tenure Committee appointed by the PTRM Chairperson.

II.3. Peer Review

Peer review is required for reappointment, third year review, promotion, tenure, and 5 year review. Advance notice to the review of at least one week will be provided.

- a. For each member (reviewee) up to the rank of associate professor, there will be a reviewer designated, preferably of rank above the reviewee's. The reviewers will be appointed during the first meeting of the department PTRM committee.
The committee will identify the reviewer to the reviewee.

- b. The reviewee and reviewer will work together to gather and consolidate the data needed for the Fall evaluation.
- c. Generally, the responsibility for initiating and for getting the job done is the reviewee's.
- d. Reviewer assignments may be changed each year in order to maintain a fresh point of view on each reviewee's performance. The appointment of a reviewer is for a one year period.

II.4. Appeal

All negative recommendations made by the PTRM committee may be appealed. All appeals shall be made in writing and be sent to the College PTRM committee. The appeal shall state clearly the grounds for appeal with supporting documents. It shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. There are three types of appeals: Substantive appeals (Perceived errors in judgment), Procedural appeals (errors in the procedure) and appeals alleging discrimination. Appeals must be delivered to the next higher level within 21 calendar days.

II.5. Documents required

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

In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations for annual review (includes annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review) contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department criteria. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder or submitted as an electronic portfolio. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

- a. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) Forms;
 - ii. current *Curriculum vitae*;
 - iii. syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
 - iv. evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
 - (A) student evaluations tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
 - (B) grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
 - v. documentation of scholarship and service.
- b. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of tenure-track faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. all of the above items listed in 5.a; and
 - ii. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.
- c. Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. all of the above items listed in 5.a;
 - ii. syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
 - iii. student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year; and
 - iv. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
- d. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
 - i. all materials listed above in 5.a and 5.b from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion; and
 - ii. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
- e. Evaluation portfolio materials for comprehensive five-year review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - i. all materials listed above in 5.a for all five (5) years;
 - ii. peer evaluations of teaching at least for the prior academic year; and
 - iii. a reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five (5) years

of his/ her work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

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

II.6. Evaluation of Teaching by peers and students

(a) Procedure of evaluation of teaching by peers

The Chair of the PTRM Committee appoints two Committee members to serve on a subcommittee for the comprehensive review of a faculty member. The subcommittee arranges for and makes classroom observation of reviewee, prepares teaching evaluation, reviews the Comprehensive Narrative Summary provided by reviewee, and prepares a written comprehensive evaluation. The PTRM committee discusses and approves the final report which is then given to the faculty member. The reviewee acknowledges reading final draft of evaluation with his or her signature. Signed evaluation submitted to Dean of the College with Merit and Promotion materials by the Tuesday before Thanksgiving in the same calendar year, with copy to Departmental Chair.

The following materials are used in the teaching evaluation:

- A syllabus for each course taught that contain all components required by the University including, course goals/objectives, methods of evaluation of student performance, and topics covered. All should be appropriate to the level and nature of the course being taught.
- Sample examinations or other means of evaluation used for each course taught. Examinations should be appropriate to the level and nature of the course being taught. Exams should also reveal evidence of teaching not only for content but also for critical thinking.
- A report on distribution of course grades for each course, preferably in the form of histograms. Distributions that are highly skewed towards high or low grades should be accompanied by an explanation for this result.

(b) Procedure of evaluation of teaching by students

The PTRM committee employs the university-wide student evaluation form to collect data from students and uses the evaluation scores in concert with all other measures of teaching effectiveness. The committee does not apply direct comparisons of numerical scores between faculty members. Faculty are encouraged to describe mitigating circumstances such as small classes, use of innovative techniques and disparities between sections of the same course.

III. REAPPOINTMENT

The criteria for reappointment are given in the Faculty Handbook and specifically stated in the Department's PTRM Criteria Guideline (see Appendix A).

All tenure-track faculty are evaluated each year of the probationary period for reappointment. The schedule for reappointment activities must adhere to the University PTRM calendar as given in the Faculty Handbook.

1. The recommendation for re-appointment is made by the Tenure Committee.
2. A faculty evaluation dossier of each tenure-track faculty is prepared by the individual with the assistance of a reviewer. The dossier should be prepared as indicated in the Faculty Handbook and the departmental document "GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS" (see Appendix B for details).
3. The complete faculty evaluation dossier should be available for all Tenure Committee members to review at least two weeks prior to a meeting in which the Tenure Committee will discuss the individual faculty member.
4. A letter containing the actions taken is sent to the faculty member.
5. The faculty member has the option to appeal the decision.

IV. TENURE AND PROMOTION

The PTRM committees follow the university and college guideline. The departmental specific criteria and standards are stated in the Department's PTRM Criteria Guideline (See Appendix A). The required documents and procedure are the same both for tenure and promotion. Please read the College and University PTRM documents for required documents and

materials for annual review, 3rd year review, 5th year review, tenure applications. Each committee member individually will examine the materials submitted by each department for faculty members recommended for tenure and/or promotion, and will decide whether to support or deny the recommendations. During meetings of the full Committee, each Committee member will contribute to an open discussion of each candidate.

The Procedure

1. All Rank Committee members will review candidate's Provost's Binder and Supporting Documents Binder (hereafter referred to collectively as the candidate's "dossier")
2. Following a discussion of the candidate, a vote will be taken. Voting will be by written anonymous ballot, and the Chair of the Rank Committee will tally votes. The Rank Committee chair will report to the committee only the majority opinion, not the number of votes for and against.
3. Recommendation for promotion requires a simple majority of the vote. In the case of a tie, discussion of the candidate will resume, until a subsequent vote yields a majority.
4. Notification
 - a. When a majority of the committee recommends promotion:
 - i) The Chair will prepare the college Promotion and Tenure Recommendation form.
 - ii) If a member of the committee disagrees strongly with a majority recommendation for promotion, a letter of minority opinion shall be included in the package
 - iii) The Department Chair may prepare a separate written opinion.
 - iv) The vote count will not be revealed, the Promotion and Tenure Recommendation form, dissenting opinions, and chair's opinion will be delivered to the candidate by the chair of the Rank Committee.
 - b. When a majority of the committee votes **not** to promote:
 - i) The Chair shall prepare a written "justification for denial" addressed to the chair of the College PTRM committee.
 - ii) Any or all committee members in the minority may prepare a written dissenting opinion.
 - iii) The Department Chair may prepare a separate written opinion.
 - iv) The vote count, the written justification for denial, dissenting opinions, and chair's opinion shall be delivered to the candidate, in person, by the Departmental Chair or the Department Chair and chair of the Rank Committee
 - c. The written recommendation or justifications for denial,

dissenting

opinions, and chair's letter will be placed in the candidate's dossier by the Rank Committee Chair before delivery to the College PTRM committee.

V. DEPARTMENTAL MERIT AND ANNUAL REVIEW

Faculty must prepare and submit an annual report. In conjunction with guidelines issued by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty or section AR II of the Annual Report form or section CAR II of the Chairperson's Annual Report form shall serve as the basis for merit evaluation. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their AR or CAR Part II. The faculty member should demonstrate the correlation of workload agreement and the work actually done in terms of the percentage as listed in the agreement. See Appendix B for instructions on how to prepare annual reports. The PTRM committee will provide a letter evaluating each faculty member in terms of teaching, research and service. If necessary, a meeting with the PTRM Chair and the Chairperson may be held. The areas that need to be improved will be pointed out to the candidate. A record of marginal or unsatisfactory evaluations may suggest that the candidate may not be eligible for advancement.

The Procedure

1. All members of the Merit Committee will review each faculty member's merit folder.
2. The activity, effort, accomplishments, and effectiveness (hereafter referred to collectively as "performance") of each faculty member will be discussed.
3. Following the discussion of a faculty member's performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship and service, the faculty member's performance will be rated in each area as follows:

UNSATISFACTORY: does not meet minimum expectations

(Used especially when performance or lack thereof is detrimental to the institution and/or its students)

SATISFACTORY: meets minimum/basic expectations satisfactorily

COMMENDABLE: performance noteworthy and goes beyond call of duty

EXCELLENT: superior performance such as receiving University or College teaching awards or significant grants

4. Once a consensus is reached for all three areas, the chair of the Committee will announce the overall merit recommendation for the individual. Any committee member may call for further discussion and another vote if s/he feels the tally does not reflect verbal commentary and evaluation of that faculty member. This reconsideration may occur at any time during the period in which all faculty merit folders are under review, however it must be conducted prior to the First Friday in October. The merit recommendation will be deemed final if no member of the Committee calls for further discussion by this time.

5. The level of merit for which a faculty member is recommended will be based on performance ratings as follows, with one additional consideration, noted immediately below:

No merit: Unsatisfactory in one or more areas

Merit plus: Excellent in one or more areas and commendable
in two or more areas.

Base Merit: All other contingencies.

In addition, to be eligible for Merit plus, a faculty member must additionally go beyond meeting only basic expectations in the area of teaching; i.e., activity, effort, accomplishments, and effectiveness must be evaluated as beyond merely Satisfactory.

6. The PTRM Chair will provide each faculty member with a "Report to Faculty Member on Performance and Merit" which summarizes the Committee's evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each area, and indicates level of merit for which the faculty member will be recommended.

7. Reports to Faculty are to be signed by faculty members, returned to the Rank Committee, and then placed in merit folders.

VI. THREE-YEAR REVIEW

Tenure track faculty will undergo a review during their third year of tenure earning status to determine if they are making normal progress toward promotion to associate professor and tenured status. The candidate needs to prepare a dossier similar to a promotion and tenure dossier. This review will examine the dossier of the candidate and compare accomplishments with assigned duties. The PTRM committee will review the dossier and other materials supplied by the candidate, such as publications, works in progress, grant proposal reviews, student and peer evaluations. On the basis of this review, the committee will write

a detailed report that makes clear recommendations to the candidate concerning his or her progress towards tenure. Strengths and/or weaknesses in the candidate's record will be brought to the attention of the candidate and the Department. If the review is strongly critical of the candidate's progress toward P & T status, the PTRM committee will communicate its opinion in writing to the candidate. The mentor and the P & T committee may then recommend a plan to improve performance. See the college PTRM and university guidelines for required documents.

VII. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

The Five-year review blinder will be identical to those of PROVOST's PTRM blinder as described in section IV along with a comprehensive narrative summary of no more than five typed pages highlighting his/he accomplishments and a peer teaching evaluation. The rank committee conducts the five-year review process. A final evaluation report will be prepared by the committee and delivered to the faculty member under review. The reviewee acknowledges reading the final report by signing the report. The signed report shall be submitted to the Dean of the College.

All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the dean of the college. The department PTRM committee shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service. The statement should be consistent with the department's standards and expectations (stipulated in the department PTRM document) and submitted to the department chair by the second Friday in October. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October. The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the department committee, the written evaluation of the department chair, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the department PTRM committee chair to the dean's office by the second Friday in November. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October.

Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the department chairperson or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and the dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair and dean.

IX. CALENDAR

(A full year is June 1 to May 31; Committee active for one year, starting on first Tuesday of February. Activities below must be completed on or before the dates stated.)

- **Third Friday in January:**

- All documents for the third year review are submitted to the Chair of the department
- Reappointment letters are sent to first-year tenure-track faculty
- The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and dean.

- **Last business-day of January**

Requests to be considered for promotion due from faculty.

- **Second Friday in February:** Changes in Policies and Procedures of the Rank

- **First Friday in March**

- provide faculty under third-year review with written feedback
- notify first year faculty of non-reappointment decisions.

- **Last business-day of March:**

Classroom observations of faculty up for Comprehensive Review are completed. Comprehensive Narrative Summaries submitted from faculty undergoing Comprehensive Review.

- **Last Friday of April**

Written evaluations, i.e., Comprehensive Reviews, discussed, modified, approved. Comprehensive Reviews presented to reviewees for signature

- **Second Friday in May**
Annual Faculty Workload Expectations document (AFWEs) due to Departmental Chair for review.
- **Third Friday in June**
Faculty promotion dossiers, annual reports and merit folders must be submitted to the Department Chair or designee(s).
- **Third Friday in Sep**
notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- **Third Friday in September**
 - Last day for faculty update their promotion dossiers and to update merit folders regarding work done prior to June 1.
 - First year faculty must finalize Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Tract Faculty (SENTF) with the **department chairperson**
 - Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.
- **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."
- **Second Friday in October**
Departmental PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the departmental chairperson.
- **Fourth Friday in October:**
 - The department PTRM committee report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member
 - Report on Performance and Merit given to all non first-year faculty. Decisions on rank (promotion) given to faculty members that had requested promotion.
 - All documentation for the 3rd year review is submitted by the faculty member to the department committee
 - Rank Committee chair solicits, from all tenure and tenure-track faculty, suggestions for improving/modifying policies and procedures regarding Comprehensive Reviews, merit decisions and promotion.

- **The Tuesday before Thanksgiving**
All required documents regarding Comprehensive Reviews, promotion and merit decisions delivered to the College P & T Committee.
- **SECOND FRIDAY IN NOVEMBER**
documents delivered by the department PTRM chairperson to the Dean's office
- **Third Friday in November.**
Proposed changes in Policies and Procedures of the Rank Committee (i.e., this document) presented to full Department for consideration and vote.
- **First Friday in December**
Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.
- **Second Friday in December**
First-year faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson
- **First Friday in January**
The department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

IX. APPENDICES

Appendix A

Department's PTRM Criteria Guideline

The Department's promotion and tenure criteria guideline presented below is supplemental to and consistent with the College and University Tenure Policy. It is not intended to modify or replace the College and University Tenure and Promotion procedures. This document states the philosophy of the Department and the specific standards used by the departmental PTRM committee in making its PTRM recommendations.

(1) Criteria for Tenure

1. **An Effective Teaching Record** is a necessary part of a successful tenure and promotion case. A candidate must demonstrate a commitment to teaching excellence and have a commendable teaching record. Examples of activities considered as teaching include, but are not limited to, the following:

- teaching effectiveness
- student learning and achievement
- course and curriculum development
- student advising and mentorship
- authorship of teaching aids and tools
- course revision
- course coordination
- service on graduate project committees

Evidence of success in teaching will be judged using the following materials:

1. Student evaluations: they should be comparable to or better than the department average. Special emphasis is placed on evaluation of the instructor's contribution to the class and the overall quality of the class.
2. Peer evaluations
3. Course/curriculum development
4. Number of undergraduate and graduate projects supervised.
5. Number of master thesis supervised.

2. Scholarly Accomplishments

Accomplishments in research play a central role in tenure and promotion. The Department must determine the relative weight given to various types and forms of scholarly activity, such as grants, journal articles, conference papers and the number of doctoral students supervised. Each candidate's record will be evaluated according to the standards of their area specialty. The Department expects the candidate to participate actively and continuously in research and scholarly contributions to teaching and education. Publication records emphasizing quality will be preferred over records emphasizing quantity. To attain the aforementioned level of quality and productivity in research, it is of paramount importance that junior faculty members publish on average one or two papers in reputable conferences and/or journals per year continuously. The quality of their papers will be judged by conference/journal recognition and the acceptance rate. The quantity and quality of unpublished working papers,

manuscripts, and grant proposals are important elements in assessing a person's continuing commitment to scholarly activities.

It is worth pointing out that a strong research record in terms of journal publications plays an important role in a successful tenure and promotion case beyond the Department level. Effort at applying external funding is strongly encouraged and success in attracting external funding is extremely significant. The department has large graduate programs, master thesis and doctoral dissertation supervision is part of the scholarship activities, which should be considered as part of the scholarly contribution.

3. Service

All candidates are expected to become involved in the Department, College and University operations by serving in various capacities (for example, on committees, boards, panels, task forces and commissions). Voluntary participation in the Department, the College and the University activities such as Commencement, Open house, and Towson Destination is strongly encouraged. Although there is a reasonable limit to the extent of involvement (to be managed by the Department Chair), it is not unreasonable for these tasks to occupy an average of 15-20 percent of a faculty member's time.

The expectations of the Department on tenure track faculty members are (i) responsible citizenship in the Department, including participation in certain departmental committees, and (ii) professional service that contributes to academic accomplishment (for example, refereeing articles and manuscripts, seminar participation, running seminar series, etc).

4. Collegiality is an integral part of a faculty member's professional career. Collaboration and constructive cooperation are important qualities when considering promotion and tenure. Criteria for evaluating collegiality may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- projecting a positive attitude and interacting positively with colleagues
- treating others with respect
- helping to make the Department a productive and friendly environment

(2) Criteria for Promotion

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a record of satisfactory or better performance in all three categories of professorial activities. In addition to excellence in teaching, a candidate must also demonstrate a record of distinction in research and active engagement in service.

1. Effective teaching performance in teaching shall be evidenced by a consistent pattern among various indicators such as

- student evaluations showing above average or better scores
- peer ratings showing above average or better ratings of teaching content and classroom performance (based on direct observations)
- written comments from students
- evidence of supervision of student research

Other activities representing contributions to effective teaching are: the development and implementation of continuing education courses, the creative use of technology in teaching, assuming a leadership role in curriculum redesign, and development of a new course.

2. Distinction in research should be demonstrated by a record of journal publications, research papers in peer-reviewed conferences of high quality (as indicated by the rate of rejection) and repeated attempts at applying external grants. Other activities representing scholarship accomplishments are: professional awards based on scholarly achievement, conducting workshops, chairing sessions at professional meetings, and documented research in progress.

3. Satisfactory performance in service can be summarized as a good citizenship in the Department and in the college by serving on departmental, college, and/or university committees consistent with their rank and experience. Voluntary participation in the Department, the College and the University activities such as Commencement, Open house, and Towson Destination is expected.

Promotion to Rank of Professor

Since promotion to Full Professor is the ultimate step in academic recognition, a candidate for the rank of Professor must demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service.

1. A professor must show a high level of teaching effectiveness. The candidate should have excellent rapport with students and must be able to communicate his/her expert knowledge to students, which may be demonstrated by student evaluations and/or highly favorable reputation as a teacher among students and colleagues
Distinction in teaching shall be evidenced by a consistent pattern among various indicators such as:
 - achievement of a significant award for teaching
 - development of a new course or teaching program
 - A demonstration of the ability to direct graduate students working on a thesis to a satisfactory completion
 - other activities representing contributions to teaching that exceed expectations, such as the development and implementation of continuing education courses, the creative use of technology in teaching, taking a leadership roles in curriculum redesign or development, etc.
2. Distinction in research ordinarily entails:
 - A sustained flow of a high-quality research productivity with a body of published research work
 - consistent scholarly productivity is expected beyond that which earned promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
 - significant journal publications
 - continuing effort in the publication of research articles in reputable conferences
 - well defined research area in which conducting independent research success
 - success in attracting external grants

Other indicators of professional accomplishments:

- service on the editorial board of scientific or professional journals
 - publication of an authored or edited book
 - service on study sections or review panels of grant agencies
3. Satisfactory performance in service is demonstrated by a good citizenship in the Department and in the college by serving on departmental, college, and university committees consistent with their rank and experience.

Distinction in service to the university should be indicated by service that is beyond that expected in the typical duties of an associate professor:

- chairing a college and/or university committee
- serving in an other administrative role in the department or college beyond the typical duties of an associate professor
- serving a committee member in a national or international organization
- serving as an officer or board member in a state, regional, national, or international organization
- serving on an accreditation committee of recognized accreditation body

The candidate should demonstrate substantial commitment to and involvement in institutional service beyond the Department. This includes service to the College, the University and to the profession. The Department also expects the candidate to demonstrate leadership in the Department. This leadership may include the mentorship of junior faculty, efforts to attract new faculty to the Department, and increasing the visibility of the Department and other administrative responsibilities.

External evaluation letters are required for promotion to professor. In general, external evaluators should not be current or former mentors, students or collaborators within the past five years, nor should they pose other significant potential conflicts of interest. Candidates may also submit names of those persons that they prefer not be asked to write an evaluation. The dept will follow the university and college guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS

This guide has been developed to assist faculty members in documenting their research, teaching and service activities. It is in response to a need to prepare a properly documented and formatted dossier such as annual reports and P & T materials. This guideline is intended to supplement the Department's Promotion & Tenure Criteria Guideline.

Faculty members are expected to provide evidence in their dossiers of meaningful contributions in teaching, scholarly growth and service at Towson University. Work done in rank and prior to rank should be clearly designated. The term "in rank" applies to the current rank while at Towson, unless credit is granted during the time of hiring – in terms of number of years – for a prior employment at the same rank.

In evaluating the Candidate's record, the emphasis will be on assessing the quality of work. It is incumbent upon the candidate to document the quality of his/her records and to provide supporting evidence whenever appropriate.

Most listings should be in reverse chronological order and may be classified into the following categories:

Evidence of Effective Teaching

- Include students' comments and evaluation scores
- Include peer's evaluation scores and comments
- Include other supporting evidence
- Include a developed curriculum
- Include evidence of service learning

Grants Received

- External, internal, research, curriculum or equipment grants should be clearly distinguished
- Identify projects, funding agency, grant/project number, date of grant or contract award
- For grants and activities involving other faculty, the candidate's specific accomplishments as a principal investigator or co-principal investigator should be identified clearly
- Percent effort, total dollar amount and total dollar amount housed in a Towson account should be accurately indicated
- All grant approval documents should be submitted

Journal /Conference Publications

In addition to a copy of the publication (not a manuscript), include the followings if available

- Journal reputation or standing in the discipline
- For publications with multiple authors, identify the extent of your contribution. You should list the authors' names in the order as they appear in the publication
- On-line journal publications should be clearly marked and listed in a different category other than the "referred Journal publication" section
- Impact factor of journal / conference(e.g., CITESEER (<http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/impact.html>) provides information on impact factors of over one thousand Computer Science journals and conferences)
- Indicate if a publication did not go through a peer-review process
- If a paper is accepted by abstract only, it should be indicated.
- Acceptance rate of the conference should be provided if available.

Books and Book Chapters

- For a textbook, include the information of the contract
- For a research book, indicate if it is peer-reviewed
- List the expected completion date and the name of the publisher
- Book chapters: clearly indicate if peer reviewed, list as complete citation including all authors, chapter title, book title, publisher, year, edition, and pagination.

Presentations / Invited Talks

- List conference /workshop name, sponsoring organization and date
- Indicate if invited or submitted presentation.
- Include Letters of acknowledgement, email or other confirmation evidence

Unpublished Work and /or Work in Progress

Include submitted but not yet accepted papers, grant proposals, and unfinished books

- Submit a copy of the work
- Status of the submission should be indicated.
- include numerical review scores if available.
- For work done under a "non-disclosure" agreement, provide supporting evidence, such as a copy of the agreement, an email or a letter stating your contribution. You need to provide all the information that is not confidential.

Patents, Awards and Honors

- Indicate title of award or honor, sponsoring organization, date.
- Include a letter of acknowledgement
- Include evidence of a granted patent

Evidence of Performance in Service

Service includes service to the Department, College and University governance; discipline-related service to the community; and service to the discipline/profession. Such documentation includes, but is not limited to, the followings:

- Letters of acknowledgement for participation on a committee except the Department, College and University-related committees
- Acknowledgements that the candidate has refereed papers, participated on a program committee, or otherwise served as a reviewer for grants, papers, or the like
- Award letters (e.g., for being elected as a fellow for a professional organization)
- Acknowledgement of participation as an official in a professional organization
- Letters of invitation/acknowledgement/support/thanks from community/industry