

# University Senate

## TOWSON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON FACULTY EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION, TENURE/REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT

Approved by the University Senate May 1, 2000

### I. EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY

#### A. Board of Regents

Minimum requirements for appointment, tenure, and promotion are established by the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents and are stated in the "University System of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty." Minimum workload and responsibilities for faculty as established by the Board of Regents are stated in the "University System of Maryland Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities." The policies unique to Towson University are consistent with the USM policies. Clear and previously-stated standards and expectations needed for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit fulfill the University responsibility outlined in the 1971 AAUP statement on "Procedural standards in the Renewal or Non-renewal of Faculty Appointments."

#### B. University

The "Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty" and the "Towson University Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities" provide the basis for standards and expectations common to all full or part-time tenure track faculty. The tenure and/or promotion decision is based both on the needs of the University (programs, enrollments, strategic direction) and the competence and quality of the individual. Common standards and expectations for all faculty include the following basic activities:

- o A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical and professional behavior.
- o A faculty member is primarily concerned with excellence in teaching.
- o A faculty member meets classes as scheduled and is available for advising and consultation through office hours.
- o A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college and university.
- o A faculty member is committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and is committed to continuing professional development and scholarly growth.
- o A faculty member shares the responsibility of university governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.

#### C. College

Each college may create its own standards and expectations, with clear criteria for evaluation. However, no college may contradict or conflict with the University or Board of Regents standards.

#### D. Department

Each department and/or interdisciplinary program may create its own standards and expectations, with clear criteria for evaluation. However, no department may contradict or conflict with College, University, or Board of Regents expectations. Departments must submit clear and specific standards and expectations to the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committee for approval. A resource template, *"Towson University Guidelines for the Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service"* is included as **Addendum A**. Departments may adopt these standards in whole or in part, or departments may create their own, with written approval or disapproval indicated by each faculty member's signature. These department documents remain in effect until changed by the department faculty and approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

1. Department chairpersons\* are responsible to work with continuing faculty to prepare an "Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations" which is Part II of the new Annual Report (AR form). ("Department Chairperson" also refers to Interdisciplinary Program Directors in those programs with separate faculty.)

2. All new faculty shall receive a "Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty" (SENTF form) which must include the following items:

- Board of Regents and Towson University's criteria for promotion
- Standards and Expectations of the University, College, and Department
- Expectations unique to the position

## II. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. The responsibility for presenting the annual review materials, the five-year comprehensive review, and/or the case for reappointment, promotion, or tenure rests with the faculty member. Each faculty member, with the help of the department chairperson or designee(s), is expected to prepare a dossier that addresses the professorial role expectations of faculty in the university and the candidate's college and department.

B. Type of Review determines dossier material and process

1. **Annual review of all faculty:** Annual review materials must include the following documents:

- AR (Annual Report) or CAR (Chairpersons' Annual Report) Form
- Curriculum vitae
- Syllabi of current courses
- Evaluation, as appropriate, of teaching and advising

2. **Annual review of non-tenured faculty:** Tenure track faculty shall add the following items to items listed above in II. B.1.

- Peer evaluations
- Departmental recommendation letter, which must include a written report on the candidate's progress toward tenure

3. **Full Review for Candidates for tenure and/or promotion:** A critical part of the dossier shall be a narrative statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met and integrated the teaching, research, and service expectations of all faculty. All materials listed above in II.B. 1. and II. B. 2. from the candidate's date of hire or last promotion must also be included.

4. **Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty:** Once every five years, the annual review shall be replaced by a comprehensive five-year review. See "Comprehensive Review Policies and Procedures, Towson University" for details.

5. **Merit Review:** Merit review shall be concurrent with annual review. The review shall follow policies, standards, and procedures outlined in the department's merit policy as approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee. The merit appeal process shall follow the same protocol as the promotion and tenure process. See Section IV. for a description of levels of merit.

### **III. PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR CANDIDATES FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION**

A. All deliberations pertaining to promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit at all levels shall be confidential.

B. The faculty candidate shall apply for consideration according to approved departmental procedures. (This is often required a year before candidacy.)

C. The faculty candidate shall submit a summative dossier inclusive of the AR form and a current curriculum vita. A lengthier, supportive document that lends specificity to the candidate's credentials should also be submitted with the above.

D. The Department Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment (and Merit) Committee shall make a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure of a faculty candidate to the Dean of the appropriate College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

1. Eligible members of the Department Rank/Tenure Committee shall be determined by the standards specified in the Department's document as approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

2. The appropriate Department Committee shall prepare a concisely written statement supportive of the recommended decision consistent with the department documentation.

3. The Department Chairperson may submit a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the committee's recommendation. The Department Chairperson shall serve as a voting member in all Department Rank Committees, Department Tenure/Reappointment Committee(s), and Merit Committee(s).

4. The recommended decision shall be conveyed to the faculty candidate, inclusive of any Department chair's statement and a record of the vote count, and shall be forwarded with the candidate's dossier. Negative decisions should be delivered in person by the Department Chairperson (or designee) or sent by certified mail to the candidate's home.

5. The faculty candidate's lengthier, supportive file shall be retained by the Department and shall be made available to the Dean and/or the College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee upon request for purposes of either an appeal and/or clarification of issues that arise as the process moves forward.

6. The faculty member may submit a written appeal of the Department Rank/Tenure and Merit Committee's decision to the Dean's office for the College Committee. The appeal should be delivered by certified mail or in person, within fifteen (15) business days of having been notified of the decision. The appeal should be accompanied by supportive materials.

D. The Chair of The College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean of the College shall each submit a written recommendation to the Provost. The Dean and the College Committee shall also receive appeals from faculty candidates.

1. The College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committee shall consist of one representative from each department elected at large by the College by the tenured and tenure-track members of the department for a period of three years. These three-year terms will be staggered to insure some continuity from year to year. Eligible members include tenured faculty, at the rank of associate and full professor. Faculty who are candidates for promotion and Department Chairpersons are not eligible. The Dean of the College will serve as non-voting member of this committee.

2. The College Promotion Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee shall prepare a concisely written statement explaining the recommended decision.

3. The Dean may submit a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the committee's recommendation.

4. The recommended decision shall be conveyed to the faculty candidate, inclusive of any Dean's statement and a record of the vote count, and shall be forwarded with the candidate's dossier. Negative decisions shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent by certified mail to the candidate's home.

5. The faculty member may submit a written appeal of the College and/or Dean's decision to the Provost by certified mail or in person, within fifteen (15) business days of having been notified of the decision. The appeal shall be accompanied by supportive materials.

E. The Dean of the College shall submit the faculty candidate's file to the Provost. The Provost shall also receive appeals from faculty candidates. Following a review of the composite record, the Provost shall prepare a substantive letter of recommendation conveyed to the faculty candidate, Department Rank/Tenure Committee chairperson, Department Chairperson and Dean of the College, and filed with the record.

F. The faculty candidate may submit a written appeal of the Provost's decision to the University President within two weeks of having been notified of the decision.

G. The final decision for promotion and tenure shall be made by the University President; the final decision for merit rests with the Provost.

#### **IV. METHODS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

The University should have faculty evaluation methods that are consistent with and reflective of the roles and responsibilities of faculty members. Departments may use **Addendum A: "Towson University Guidelines for the Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service,"** or develop their own. Methods for evaluation developed by departments shall specify the criteria and procedures that shall be applied to the faculty roles of teaching, scholarship and service. This shall include the role of the "Agreement on Faculty Workload and Expectations " or "AFWE "section of the Annual Review (AR form). The evaluation materials must be understandable and easy to follow, reflecting a commitment to collegial responsibility. Faculty who do not meet the basic standards and expectations for teaching, scholarship and/or service may be subject to a denial of merit.

##### **A. Teaching and Advising**

1. The scholarship of teaching takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology or classroom-based research to improve teaching, faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, involvement in distributive learning or the development of new courses and programs, especially those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work or K-16 partnerships.

2. The primary purpose of the faculty academic advisor is to assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their life goals. Through private, individual conferences with students, the faculty academic advisor should provide assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.

3. Evaluation of teaching and advising shall include information from the following sources:

##### **a.) Evaluation of Teaching by Students**

Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. Such an evaluation must be recognized for what it is: one kind of evaluation, of a generalized nature, and to be considered only in concert with all other measures of teaching effectiveness. Each department shall develop a form or forms which shall be used by all members of the department.

Student evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner to assure confidentiality of the student. Student evaluation forms, with a description of the method and timing of administration, shall be approved annually and included in the department Promotion and Tenure document submitted to the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee for approval.

Tenured faculty shall be evaluated by students at least once each academic year; probationary faculty shall be evaluated every semester.

b) Evaluation of Teaching by Peers

Classroom visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the person is being considered for promotion or for reappointment or tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the comprehensive five-year review.

Departments must develop discipline-specific criteria or guidelines for observing and reporting classroom observations. These should be included in the documents submitted to the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee for approval.

Further standards and expectations for teaching shall be evaluated by specific criteria developed within individual departments and approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

c) Evaluation of Advising

For those faculty members who advise students as part of their workload, student evaluations of advising are required.

d) Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation of teaching and/or advising effectiveness shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.

B. Scholarship

Scholarship and research take many forms. Faculty may conduct research that generates new knowledge or synthesizes and integrates knowledge. These research agendas may be represented by publications, presentations, or grants. Faculty also conduct their scholarship in the development of creative products, such as original works or integrating creative knowledge in performances, exhibits or other expressive presentations. Other faculty engage in research that is applied, finding new ways to use knowledge for practical purposes, including the scholarship of teaching or of solving problems within academia or the larger community, such as involvement in K-16 partnerships, professional development schools, and other innovative partnerships. Faculty also engage in developing and publishing software and in finding new classroom uses for existing technology. Interdisciplinary efforts where faculty work to expand their knowledge and apply it in new ways constitute yet another form of applied research and scholarship. Often collaboration requires additional efforts on the part of the faculty members involved, but the many tangible and intangible benefits make such efforts desirable; thus, such effort should be recognized in the evaluation of scholarship.

1. Faculty should be guided by the definitions of scholarship/research that have been defined by their college and department as well as by the general standards in Addendum A, "Towson University Guidelines for the Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship and Service," appended to this document. Evaluation must be in accordance with specific criteria. Departments are to develop specific and objective criteria for evaluating faculty scholarship and research.

2. Moreover, departments are to encourage collaboration and the mentoring of junior faculty when such criteria are difficult to articulate. It is through such collegial exchange, respect and consensus that the larger missions of both the university and the discipline(s) are served.

3. Departmental criteria should be approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee and provided each member at the time of initial employment and/or revision of criteria.

#### C. Service

Service is broadly defined to include participation in the governing and administrative activities of the department, college, or university. It also may include service to one's professional discipline or the larger community outside the university if such service draws upon the faculty member's discipline or interdisciplinary specialty or furthers the university mission.

Service may be evaluated by the university standards in this document or by specific criteria developed within individual departments and approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

### **V. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS**

A. The University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee shall be composed of seven faculty members: one member elected from each college and one appointed by the senate. Members serve three-year terms beginning June 1 and ending May 31 of their third year. Meetings shall be scheduled at least monthly during the academic year.

B. Within two weeks of the beginning of its committee year, the Committee shall hold a meeting for the purpose of electing by simple majority vote a chairperson, who shall notify the Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee of the University Senate of the names of the Committee members and the chairperson.

C. The Provost or designee shall serve in an ex officio capacity but may not vote.

D. A quorum shall be a majority of the voting members.

#### E. Duties

1. To administer the system of faculty evaluation by establishing the calendar, standards, and guidelines and approving department documents.

2. To define standards for merit consideration.

3. To review the petition of a faculty member who has alleged inadequate consideration in terms of compliance with fair and regular procedures has been given in cases of non-reappointment, promotion, or merit.

#### F. Procedures

1. Distribute documents to department chairpersons .

2. Receive for review all department promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit documents by the date in the University Promotion and Tenure calendar (if documents have been changed) and notify both the department and the Dean of the College of approval status.

3. Recommend policy changes to the Senate.

4. Submit a year end report to the Senate by June of each year.

## **VI. MERIT**

In conjunction with cost-of-living adjustments in faculty salaries, which should be mandated annually, Board of Regents regulations require that merit salary increases be awarded using a merit system that results in differential increments. The "Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Faculty" or the "Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations" (AFWE) section of the Annual Report (AR form) or the Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR 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 Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations. All faculty will be evaluated each year at the department level for merit.

There will be two levels of merit increase to salary within the three categories of merit as follows:

- o Not Meritorious: Faculty whose performance fails to adequately meet explicit standards.
- o Satisfactory (Base Merit): Faculty whose work is deemed competent and thus contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, college, and department.
- o Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Faculty who are not only deemed satisfactory but who also excel in at least one of the dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Each department will explicitly and clearly define the above categories for use in their merit deliberations.

Notification and appeals of merit decisions follow the same procedures as those for promotion and tenure/reappointment. Faculty who wish to appeal their department's decision concerning merit should direct their appeal to the college Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

Procedural appeals are directed to the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee.

## **VII. CALENDAR AND FORMS**

A. All departments and programs shall abide by the calendar appended to this document as [Addendum B](#).

B. All faculty must complete the Annual Report (AR) form appended to this document ([Addendum C](#)). This form replaces the FAR, SSE, AFWE, AFWE Correlation Statement (Annual Summary Statement).

C. First year tenure-track faculty, in cooperation with their Department Chairperson, shall complete the statement on "Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty" (SENTF form). [Addendum D is the SENTF form](#).

D. Department Chairpersons and Program Directors shall complete the Chairperson's Annual Report (CAR) form appended to this document ([Addendum E](#)). This form replaces the CAR, SSE, AFWE, AFWE Correlation Statement.

E. The Department Summary Recommendation (DSR) form appended to this document ([Addendum F](#).) shall be completed each fall for all faculty holding a full-time contract. This form replaces the DRTMR form.

*Approved by the University Senate 5/ 1/2000*