

Towson University

Audiology, Speech Language Pathology & Deaf Studies

Promotion and Tenure Expectations & Policies

Approved by the Department of ASLD on 10/23/17.

Approved by the College of Health Professions on 2/2/2018.

Approved by the University on 3/09/2018.

Towson University
Audiology, Speech Language Pathology & Deaf Studies
Promotion and Tenure Expectations & Policies

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Expectations for Tenured, Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty | 5 |
| A. University Expectations | 5 |
| B. Department Expectations | 6 |
| 1. University based expectations from Towson University ART 2010 document | 6 |
| 2. Faculty workload expectations by faculty classification | 7 |
| 3. ASLD department expectations for T/TT, clinical, and lecturer faculty | 7 |
| 4. Additional ASLD department expectations for T/TT and clinical faculty | 9 |
| II. Required Documents and Dates for Faculty Evaluations | 10 |
| A. Due Dates for Documentation and Notification | 11 |
| 1. Annual Review, Promotion and/or Tenure Review, and 5-year Review | 11 |
| 2. Merit Review | 11 |
| 3. Application for Consideration for Promotion and/or Tenure | 11 |
| 4. Reappointment of First-Year Faculty | 11 |
| 5. Third Year Comprehensive Review | 11 |
| 6. Five Year Comprehensive Review | 11 |
| B. Portfolio Documents | 11 |
| 1. Type of Portfolio | 12 |
| 2. Content of Portfolio | 12 |
| C. Maintaining portfolios | 16 |
| III. Policies, Procedures, Timelines and Committees | 16 |
| A. Promotion and/or Tenure Timelines for Tenure-Track Faculty | 16 |
| 1. Promotion & Tenure Reviews | 16 |
| 2. Early Tenure Reviews | 16 |
| 3. Delayed Tenure Reviews | 16 |
| 4. Promotion Reviews | 17 |
| B. Promotion Timelines for Clinical Faculty | 17 |
| C. Committees | 17 |
| 1. ASLD Representative to the CHP PTRM Committee | 17 |
| 2. ASLD Department PTRM Committee Chair | 17 |
| 3. ASLD Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee | 18 |
| 4. ASLD Department Reappointment and Merit (RM) Committee | 20 |
| D. Committee Policies and Procedures | 21 |
| 1. Absent Members and Quorums | 21 |
| 2. Committee Schedule and Deadlines | 22 |
| 3. Meeting Policies | 22 |
| E. Faculty Appeals | 23 |
| 1. Negative Recommendations | 24 |
| 2. Appeals | 24 |
| F. Changes to Promotion and Tenure Expectations and Policies | 26 |
| IV. Faculty Evaluation for Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion | 26 |
| A. Reappointment Recommendations | 26 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. One-year reappointment recommendations | 26 |
| 2. Multi-year contract recommendations for clinical faculty | 26 |
| 3. Subsequent three-year contracts | 27 |
| B. Reappointment Criteria | 27 |
| 1. Appropriate Degree | 27 |
| 2. Teaching Effectiveness | 29 |
| 3. Scholarly Growth | 29 |
| 4. Service | 30 |
| C. Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendations for Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty | 30 |
| 1. University Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure | 30 |
| 2. ASLD Department Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure | 31 |
| a) Workload Profiles | 31 |
| b) Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure | 32 |
| c) Standards for Promotion to Professor | 33 |
| d) General Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty | 35 |
| e) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor | 36 |
| f) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor | 36 |
| g) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Professor | 37 |
| h) Examples and evidence for a clinical faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with scholarship standards | 38 |
| D. Third Year Review Process | 39 |
| E. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Process | 40 |
| 1. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Assistant Professor Rank | 40 |
| 2. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Associate Professor Rank | 41 |
| 3. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Professor Rank | 41 |
| V. Faculty Annual Review and Merit Recommendations | 41 |
| A. Criteria for Department Merit Recommendations | 41 |
| B. Merit Criteria in the Area of Teaching | 41 |
| C. Merit Criteria in the Area of Scholarship | 42 |
| D. Merit in the Area of Service | 44 |
| VI. Department Methods of Evaluating, Teaching, Advising, Supervision, and Administration | 46 |
| A. Peer Evaluations | 46 |
| 1. Qualifications of Faculty Peer Evaluators | 46 |
| 2. Frequency of Peer Evaluations | 46 |
| 3. Peer Evaluation Process | 48 |
| B. Student Evaluation of Courses | 49 |
| 1. Quantitative Student Evaluations | 49 |
| 2. Qualitative Student Evaluations | 49 |
| 3. Instructors Self Analysis | 49 |
| C. Advising Evaluations | 49 |
| 1. Procedures for Completing Advising Evaluations | 50 |
| D. Evaluation of Clinical Supervision | 50 |
| 1. Procedures for Completing Clinical Supervision Evaluations | 50 |
| E. Evaluation of Administrative Abilities | 50 |
| VII. Approval of the Promotion and Tenure Document | 51 |

Appendices

| | |
|---|----|
| Appendix A: Promotion and Tenure Calendar | 52 |
| Appendix B: Student Quantitative Evaluations of Courses | 53 |
| Appendix C: Scholarship Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure | 54 |
| Appendix D: Scholarly Activities for Merit Evaluation | 56 |
| Appendix E. Evaluation of Teaching | 58 |
| Appendix F. External Requirements for Limitations on Merit Awards | 62 |

Towson University
Audiology, Speech Language Pathology & Deaf Studies
Promotion and Tenure Expectations & Policies

I. Expectations for Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Clinical Faculty

In accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in the “Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty” (ART), and the College of Health Professions Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures (CHP PTRM, January 2011), All tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Audiology, Speech Language Pathology & Deaf Studies (ASLD) are expected to meet the following standards and expectations. In addition, clinical faculty are required to follow the CHP “Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit” (developed 5/1/09). When the term “Instructor” is used in this document, it refers to the individual who is teaching the course.

A. University Expectations

The Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank (Promotion), and Tenure of Faculty; Towson University Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities; and Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit are consistent with USM policies. Common standards and expectations for faculty, described in the ART document include the following basic activities:

1. A faculty member shall fulfill his/her workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours, and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
2. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
3. A faculty member shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
4. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship.
5. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance.
6. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described herein.
7. It is neither feasible nor practical to identify in these policies each of the factors to be considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and reappointment. The evaluative process requires the exercise of sound judgment, confidential deliberation and knowledge of the University, its educational mission and objectives. Many and varied

factors are considered in the decisional process including, among others, teaching, research, scholarship, scholarly growth and potential, creative activity and service. Accordingly, the evaluative criteria referenced in these policies are not exclusive and will be considered together with other factors (such as the approved policies from the University and College of Health Professions) deemed necessary for a thoroughly considered and well-informed decision.

B. Department Expectations

1. University Based expectations from Towson University ART 2010 document
 - a) References to "chair" and "department" include the chairperson and others in the college who have overall responsibility for faculty workload assignment, program development, and course offerings for the academic area. The department shall adhere to university and college standards, criteria and/or expectations pertaining to annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review. Additional department standards and expectations will have clear criteria for evaluation, and will not conflict with those established by the university or the college. The department document pertaining to standards, criteria and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the department PTRM committee and submitted to all tenured/tenure track department faculty for approval by simple majority vote. The department will review its documents every three years at a minimum. When changes are made to the department document, prior to submission to the university PTRM committee, the department document, with Approval Form, shall be submitted to the college PTRM committee and the dean of the college for approval by the first Friday in December. Excepting faculty who are on leave from the department (e.g., medical, sabbatical, etc.), the signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the department will signify that s/he has voted on the department PTRM documents. Following approval by the college PTRM committee and the dean, the department PTRM document shall be delivered by the dean to the chairperson of the university PTRM committee by the second Friday in February.
 - b) The department PTRM committee shall formally respond to changes and/or recommendations resulting from the review by the university and CHP PTRM committees and submit a revised copy to the college PTRM committee and the dean of the college for approval prior to the due date specified by the university PTRM committee.
 - c) All policies at the department/program level shall remain in effect until changed according to the procedures described herein. However, faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the departmental PTRM standards and criteria in effect during the year they were first appointed to a tenure-track position.

2. Faculty workload expectations by faculty classification

- a) Clinical faculty will be expected to assume the equivalent of an 8 course unit teaching load primarily in their area of clinical/professional expertise. A majority of their teaching responsibilities will be in clinical/professional practice courses in clinical/professional programs and, as appropriate, will include lab teaching and/or direct clinical/professional teaching and/or clinical/professional supervision. Clinical faculty will have advising responsibilities in accordance with department expectations beginning the second year of appointment.
- b) Lecturers will be expected to assume the equivalent of an 8-course unit teaching load primarily in applied areas in which they hold a specific expertise. Lecturers will have advising responsibilities in accordance with department expectations beginning the second year of appointment.
- c) Tenure-track faculty will be expected to assume a 6-unit load for the first year of appointment. A second year at this reduced load may be negotiable upon completion of a successful first year, based upon scholarly productivity, planned workload, and negotiations with the chairperson and dean.
- d) Tenure-track faculty (3+ years) and tenured faculty. Workload will be determined with a discussion between the faculty and chairperson regarding scholarly productivity and administrative needs of the department. The chairperson will also consult with the dean regarding faculty requests for reduced workload. It is assumed that a 7-unit load will be the workload. This may include up to one unit of advising (50+ students) and administration considerations (for directors and coordinators). A 6-unit load is generally reserved for faculty actively involved in research that includes grant-writing efforts that seek external funding (public or private) that are successful over a reasonable period of time. Workloads lower than 6-units require external-grant funding and significant advanced planning with the chairperson and dean. Tenured faculty may elect to request an 8-unit load, in years in which a significant reduction in scholarly output is anticipated or desired, upon discussion with the chairperson and dean. Tenured faculty may request a sabbatical according to the university calendar, with advanced planning and consultation with the chairperson.

3. ASLD department expectations for T/TT, clinical, and lecturer faculty.

- a) Faculty members are committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, as well as demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical and professional behavior. Collegiality has two general definitions. First, collegiality is defined as a shared responsibility within the members of an organization in which colleagues are expected to participate equally in governance and performance of tasks required for the functioning of the organization. Lack of collegiality can be evidenced by a faculty member who does not appropriately participate in faculty governance/service commensurate to their rank and employment status or at a level that is equitable relative to their colleagues. Second, it is defined in the

context of a relationship among colleagues in which respect and consideration are required for the good of the organization. Lack of collegiality can also be evidenced by behavior that is considered disruptive or inconsiderate in the context of the academic environment.

- b) Faculty members are expected to contribute to the scholarly aspects of their disciplines commensurate with their teaching load and workload expectations as outlined later in this document.
- c) Faculty members are expected to contribute to service activities both internal and external to Towson University commensurate with their rank and workload expectations as outlined later in this document.
- d) All faculty are expected to pursue continuing education related to their discipline and to document the application of continuing education to teaching, scholarship, and service, as applicable.
- e) All faculty members are expected to participate in department activities and meetings and to cooperate with other faculty members in course planning, proposals, course and curriculum implementation, and grievance and appeal procedures. Faculty members are expected to participate each year in the faculty evaluation process (such as peer evaluations and the Tenure and Promotion Committee and/or Reappointment and Merit Committee, if eligible). If space is allowed, faculty members, regardless of rank, are expected to attend commencement at least once per year. T/TT and clinical faculty are required to attend twice per year if requested by the department chairperson. Attendance at other official University ceremonies (e.g., convocation) may be requested of faculty by the department chairperson, dean, provost, or president.
- f) Continuing faculty members are expected to prepare the “Annual Report Part I” or “Chairpersons Annual Report” which summarizes activities completed in the past academic year. Faculty members are to submit the report and documentation for reported activities according to the department calendar, department policies, and university guidelines.
- g) Continuing faculty members are expected to prepare an “Annual Review (AR) Part II: Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations” in consultation with the department chairperson. This agreement will, at minimum, include statements of workload responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the upcoming academic year.
- h) New T/TT faculty, clinical faculty and lecturers will complete an AR part II, in consultation with the chairperson, by the deadline specified on the ASLD P&T calendar.
- i) All faculty must be re-appointed on an annual basis unless they are awarded tenure (Tenured faculty) or are awarded a multi-year contract (associate clinical

faculty, full clinical faculty). Lecturers are not eligible for promotion or multi-year contracts.

- j) All faculty are expected to meet workload expectations based on the AR part II that was signed by the faculty, chair and dean. All faculty are expected to periodically review the AR II and to inform the chairperson of changes in workload. In the event that the chairperson determines a change is substantive, the faculty will be required to develop a revised workload in consultation with the chairperson. Faculty should not assume major changes in the workload can simply be reported on the AR at the end of the year. Faculty are encouraged to work with the chairperson well in advance when possible, to adjust workload fairly and to provide for appropriate delivery of all instructional needs for the department.

4. Additional ASLD department expectations for T/TT and clinical faculty

- a) All faculty members must maintain the appropriate licensure, certification, and credential standards appropriate to their discipline*. Maryland State Licensure and certification from the American Speech Language Hearing Association is required for audiologists and speech language pathologists. If a faculty member is hired without licensure and/or certification (e.g., a speech or hearing scientist) to provide non-clinical teaching, this must be clearly indicated at the time of hire and in all advertisements. All T/TT and clinical faculty are expected to pursue continuing education related to the clinical aspects of their discipline as necessary to provide evidence based practice expertise in clinical teaching, scholarship, and service. (*Note: The only exception to this expectation is for T/TT faculty hired with a background in the sciences [e.g., hearing & speech sciences, neuroscience] and for whom clinical preparation was not an expectation at the time of hire, as specified in the position description. This must be clearly described in all hiring and workload documents).
- b) In addition to the AR II, required for all faculty, new tenure-track faculty (but not clinical faculty) will receive a "Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF)" as per Towson University P&T requirements. This completed form must be submitted to the chairperson by the date specified on the ASLD P&T calendar. The SENTF which must include:
 - i. Towson University and College of Health Professions criteria for merit, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
 - ii. Expectations which are unique to the department which may exceed the Board of Regent's and Towson University's expectations; and
 - iii. Expectations which are unique to the appointed position.
- c) Clinical faculty members with a minimum of 6 years in rank (clinical assistant professor) or 10 years in rank (clinical associate professor), may apply for

promotion. Clinical faculty applying for promotion to associate clinical faculty or who hold associate clinical faculty or full clinical professor rank may apply for a multi-year contract after three years, following the timeline specified in this document.

- d) Clinical faculty will have a scholarship plan congruent with their clinical/professional area.
- e) Clinical faculty will have a well-defined area of clinical expertise and will strive to achieve ongoing clinical excellence. Teaching, scholarship, and service contributions should incorporate activities that use this clinical/professional expertise/excellence. Scholarship should be closely related to the areas of expertise and responsibilities. Examples of clinical/professional excellence as demonstrated in teaching, scholarship and service include:
 - i. Demonstrated effective clinical/professional teaching or supervision/mentoring (via peer and student evaluations, awards, peer-reviewed presentations and publications, etc.).
 - ii. Demonstrated excellence in current clinical/professional practice (e.g. certifications, awards, special recognitions, supervisor and peer evaluations, etc.).
 - iii. Dissemination of clinical knowledge and expertise through publications, presentations, written reports of scholarly work, or other scholarly activities. The dissemination of these scholarly contributions may be at the local/state/regional level, national or international level and may include requests from peers, professionals, or community members to share clinical knowledge and expertise in a professional forum.
 - iv. Involvement in service activities on and off campus that use the faculty member's clinical /professional expertise (e.g., committees, programs, consultations, etc.) with a substantial impact attributed to the faculty member.

II. Required Documents and Dates for Faculty Evaluations

The responsibility for preparing materials for the first year, annual review, merit review, third-year review, five-year comprehensive review, and reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions, rests with the individual faculty member. Each faculty member is expected to prepare a portfolio that addresses the teaching, scholarship, and service expectations of faculty in the University, College of Health Professions, and ASLD Department. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly organize documents in a manner that best summarizes accomplishments for promotion, tenure or merit decisions. Guidelines for the specific order of materials are generally distributed by the Dean of the College of Health Professions and/or the Provost of the university during the spring semester. Faculty must follow these guidelines. Faculty with questions about preparing or organizing materials

should ask the Department Chair or the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair for assistance.

A. Due Dates for Documentation and Notification

1. Annual Review, Promotion and/or Tenure Review, and 5-year Review: The Annual Report Parts I and II and the supporting Portfolio are required of all tenured, tenure-track, clinical faculty and lecturers. These are due to the Department Chair by the first Friday in June. Faculty may add additional documents to the Portfolio through August 20TH.
2. Merit Review: Merit review will occur concurrently with the Annual Review. Supporting Portfolio documents and due dates are the same. Faculty members who do not meet the deadline will not be reviewed for merit.
3. Application for Consideration for Promotion and/or Tenure: Faculty members wishing to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year must submit a letter declaring their intent by the third Friday in September to the department chairperson and the chair of the tenure and promotion committee. The chair of the tenure and promotion committee will adjust the number of peer evaluations accordingly. Portfolio and other review documents are due as stated above.
4. Reappointment of First-Year Faculty: Completed AR I and II, document, and Portfolio for the initial semester are required of all first year faculty (T/TT, clinical faculty, and lecturers). All first year tenure-track faculty are also required to submit the SENTF. These are due to the Department Chair by the second Friday in December. Only course evaluations can be added after this date. Faculty who begin in the spring semester will submit their portfolio by the second Friday in June.
5. Third Year Comprehensive Review: Tenure track faculty members must undergo comprehensive review during their third year. The comprehensive portfolio and all materials for the 3rd year comprehensive review are due to the Department Chair by the second Friday in December. Only items that were not available prior to the June deadline can be added after this date.
6. Five Year Comprehensive Review: All tenured faculty members must undergo a comprehensive review every five years from the date of the most recent promotion or the date of the most recent review. If a five year comprehensive review falls on the same date as the request for promotion, both the promotion request and the 5 year comprehensive review must be completed with separate recommendations for each review.

B. Portfolio Documents

Faculty must submit a portfolio of their work as part of the review process. The type of review determines the materials that must be included in the portfolio and the organization of the

portfolio. Portfolios are arranged in 3-ring notebooks organized with dividers and a table of contents. There are two types of portfolios:

1. Type of Portfolio

a) Annual Review Portfolio

This portfolio is submitted every year for review within the department and only contains materials relevant to that year. This portfolio consists of one 1-inch notebook. In years when faculty are under consideration for promotion, tenure, or comprehensive reviews, an annual review portfolio is not submitted. Those faculty should follow directions for Multi-Year Portfolios. Binders for the portfolio will be provided by the department. If faculty choose not to use the provided binders, if the submitted binders does not conform to the specified size requirements, it will not be reviewed by the committee. All required items must be placed in the specified locations within the binder, and not tucked in front or back pockets of the notebook.

b) Multi-Year Portfolios for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review

When required, faculty must create two separate portfolios which consists of one large 3-inch comprehensive notebook for review within the department, and one Summative 1-inch notebook with “highlights” pulled from the larger portfolio (except for the 3-year review, which requires only one 3-inch comprehensive multi-year notebook). The Summative Portfolio is sent for review to the College and University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean and Provost. The larger notebook remains within the department but can be requested for review at higher levels. The provost’s office disseminates the format requirements for the summative 1-inch binder at the end of the spring semester. In the event that the provost’s portfolio guidelines conflict with the department guidelines, the provost’s guidelines supersede those of the department. Binders for the portfolio will be provided by the department. If faculty chooses not to use the provided binders, if the submitted binder does not conform to the specified size requirements, it will not be reviewed by the committee. All required items must be placed in the specified locations within the binder, and not tucked in front or back pockets of the notebook.

2. Content of portfolio

a) Annual Review Portfolios

These must include the following documents and should include documents needed to support a positive merit and reappointment recommendation. Faculty are required to review the department guidelines and to leave out materials irrelevant to the merit recommendation. The Annual review portfolio is not submitted if multi-year portfolios are submitted.

i. Section 1: Curriculum Vitae

- Updated for the current year, including service activities.

ii. Section 2: University Forms

- Annual Reports Part I & II or Chairperson’s Annual Report Forms (organized with the most recent on top, older reports below).
- All department Annual Review and Merit reports and committee letters from the date of hire, the last promotion decision, or last 5-year review (organized with the most recent on top, older reports below).
- If forms are missing, faculty must contact the department chairperson for a copy before the deadline in June. Copies of all P&T documents are kept on file in the ASLD office.

iii. Section 3: Teaching

- Teaching philosophy (optional): One page (maximum) statement of teaching philosophy (optional and may be included in narrative, if appropriate to the self-reflection).
- Teaching narrative: Two page maximum (11-point font, 1-inch margins), reflective teaching narrative. Teaching narrative must describe how the professor used multiple forms of feedback (student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-reflection, outcomes measures, as appropriate) to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness. Data used to support the narrative may be provided in an appendix at the end of the narrative and referred to in the narrative. The narrative should acknowledge negative trends in student and/or peer evaluations across time, a summary of the plan for how these trends were addressed, and the outcomes associated with the plan. For suggestions regarding items that can be used for teaching self-reflection, see the Teaching Evaluation Handbook (http://www.towson.edu/provost/resources/documents/tu_Teaching_Evaluation_Handbook_2012.pdf) and other resources available from the Office of Academic Innovation. Faculty should pay particular attention to trends in written student comments that are pervasive in one course or that span several courses. Narratives that do not follow guidelines will not be reviewed.
- Syllabi for all on-load courses taught the previous year.
- A complete print out of the “Course evaluation report” for all on-load courses taught.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Summary of clinical supervision evaluations (if appropriate)
- Summary of student advising evaluations. Please note: advising evaluations are required for those faculty receiving course release for advising. In addition, teaching narrative must also address advising evaluations for those faculty receiving a course release for advising. Supporting documentation for items listed in the Annual Report.

iv. Section 4: Scholarship

- Supporting documentation for items listed in the Annual Report or Curriculum Vitae.

v. Section 5: Service

- Supporting documentation for items listed in the Annual Report or Curriculum Vitae.

vi. Section 6: Information Added (If needed)

- This section is used by the faculty member and/or chair to include additional information that clarifies or rebuts statements in the portfolio. Documents cannot be added to this section after November 30 for fall review or after January 13 for mid-year review. The chairperson must inform the faculty member prior to adding documents to this section, including a summary of what information will be added, a justification for the addition, and provide the faculty member with at least 2 weeks to include additional information that may clarify or rebut the additional documents, prior to the evaluation of the added materials by the department or college P&T committees. The faculty member and chair must inform the PTRM Chair when documents are added. For further information, refer to the ART Appendix 3.

b) Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Reviews

All multi-year reviews require two portfolios: one 3” comprehensive portfolio plus one 1” summative portfolio.

i. Comprehensive Portfolio: The large Multi-Year comprehensive portfolio includes:

- The same sections used for the Annual Review. Each section includes documents covering the time-span under review. Sections are organized with the most recent documents on top, oldest on the bottom.
- Four page (maximum) reflective teaching narrative. Teaching narrative must describe how the professor used multiple forms of feedback (student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-reflection, and outcomes measures, as appropriate) over the period of review to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness. Data used to support the narrative may be provided in an appendix at the end of the narrative and referred to in the narrative. The narrative should acknowledge trends in student and/or peer evaluations across time, a description of how teaching was modified in response to these trends, and the outcomes associated with changes in teaching.
- The following additional documents must also be included.
 - Supporting Statement. See description under Summative Portfolio (below).
 - Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Information should be compiled in a format that allows for analysis of trends over time. It is suggested that the first part of this include one overall graphical summary of overall student numeric data, showing trends across class, class level, and across time.
 - Peer teaching evaluations across the evaluation period.

- ii. Summative Portfolio: In addition to the large Multi-Year Portfolio, faculty must prepare a Summative Portfolio of highlights that must be organized, based upon the guidelines distributed by the Provost. An example of the provost requirements is listed below. Faculty preparing a Summative Portfolio should check with the department chair to make sure the current guidelines from the dean and/or provost have not changed. The summative portfolio must be placed into a 1-inch 3-ring binder, labeled and indexed as follows:
- Section 1: Curriculum Vitae and Publication
 - Curriculum Vitae, updated and current. It is strongly recommended that faculty use the template provided by the CHP dean.
 - A copy of ONE recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity that was widely disseminated to professional peers.
 - Section 2: University Form
 - Completed and signed Annual Reports (I and II) or Chairperson's Annual Report (I and II) arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.
 - Section 3: Teaching
 - Summary of student course evaluations across the evaluation period. Information should be compiled in a format that allows for analysis of trends over time. This should also include a summary of student qualitative feedback.
 - Narrative statement of teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student, peer, and/or chair teaching evaluations across the period of review. Please note, if faculty member receives a course release for advising, narrative must address advising evaluations and a summary of student advising evaluations must be included. Narrative should be a maximum of two pages using 11-point font.
 - Peer teaching evaluations across the evaluation period.
 - Section 4: Supporting Statement
 - Supporting Statement describing the correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Includes a description of how the faculty member met expectations established by the department, college and university in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The narrative should discuss the integration of accomplishments across these areas as well as future goals in these three areas. Narratives should be written professionally and should clearly yet concisely present the argument for making a positive recommendation. This statement shall be no more than five pages, single-spaced, at 11-point font with a minimum of 1-inch margins.
 - Section 5: Written recommendations of the department tenure and promotion committee and/or the reappointment and merit committee including the following (based on the time period under review) :
 - Department P&T Committee written recommendation.
 - Department Summary Recommendation Form.
 - Department Chairperson's written recommendation.

- College of Health Professions PT Committee written recommendation.
- Dean of the College of Health Professions written recommendation.
- External reviews/letters of recommendation should not be included in the portfolio. Instead, these must be forwarded to the college dean in a separate envelope.

C. Maintaining Portfolios

Annual Review portfolios will be kept in the Department Chair's office until the department's annual review process is completed. All dossiers will be forwarded to the CHP dean's office once the last day to appeal department recommendations has passed and no later than the first Friday in November. Portfolios will be returned to faculty at the end of the following spring semester, at the conclusion of the review process at all levels.

III. Policies, Procedures, Timelines and Committees

A. Promotion and/or Tenure Timelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty members will be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion according to the date specified in their initial contracts with the university. For most faculty, the review occurs during the 6th year of the probationary period. However, length of service is not a precondition for consideration for tenure or promotion. The review occurs at three levels: department, college, and provost. Faculty members who meet all of the requisite criteria to be tenured or promoted can request an early review but should first discuss this decision with the department chair. Faculty can withdraw their early review request at any time until the request reaches the Provost. If the provost makes a negative decision on an early promotion request, that decision is final and the faculty may not request to be re-evaluated.

1. Promotion & Tenure Review: Faculty must submit a written request to the Department Chair by the third Friday in September of the year prior to consideration. For most faculty, the request is submitted in September of the 5th year of employment. By the fourth Friday in September, the department chair notifies the Dean and Provost of the faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next year.
2. Early Tenure Review: Faculty wishing for an early review must submit a written request to the Department Chair by the third Friday in September of the year prior to consideration. Faculty should discuss this decision with the Department Chair prior to submitting an early review request. By the fourth Friday in September, the department chair notifies the Dean and Provost of the faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next year.
3. Delayed Tenure Review: Faculty who have lost extensive time at work for family or medical reasons may request a one-year extension of the tenure review date. The request must be received by the Department Chair by the second Friday in January of the year prior to consideration as stated in the initial contract. The request must be approved by the Department Chair, College Dean, and Provost. Per the Towson

University ART Policies, tenure-track faculty who have held full-time appointments at the University for 7 years without achieving tenure will not have their contracts renewed. If the extension has been granted and the assistant professor has been notified in writing that tenure has been denied this individual shall be granted an additional and terminal one-year appointment in that rank but barring exceptional circumstances should receive no further consideration for tenure.

4. Promotion Reviews: Tenured faculty wishing to be considered for promotion must notify the Department Chair by the third Friday in September of the year prior to consideration. By the fourth Friday in September, the department chair notifies the Dean and Provost of the faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next year.

B. Promotion Timelines for Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are not tenure-track faculty and are not eligible for tenure. Clinical faculty members with a minimum of 6 years of full-time university teaching may apply for promotion to clinical associate professor or after 10 years of full-time university teaching may subsequently apply for promotion to clinical professor. Clinical faculty applying for promotion to associate clinical faculty or who hold associate clinical faculty or full clinical professor rank may apply for a multi-year contract, following the timeline specified in this document. Clinical faculty may simultaneously apply for promotion and request a multi-year contract. In order to be considered for promotion, clinical faculty must submit a written request to the Department Chair by the third Friday in September of the year prior to consideration. By the fourth Friday in September, the department chair notifies the Dean and Provost of the faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion in the next year.

C. Committees

The ASLD Department has two committees managing the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Annual Review and Merit process. These are the (a) Tenure and Promotion Committee, and (b) Reappointment and Merit Committee (RM). Both committees share the same chairperson but otherwise function independently.

1. ASLD Representative to the CHP PTRM Committee

The department must nominate a representative for the CHP P&T committee who will serve a three-year term and will be selected from ranks of the tenured faculty members serving on the ASLD Tenure and Promotion Committee. When needed, elections for this nomination will take place in April at a department meeting. Elections will be held by written secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member and tallied by the department chair.

2. ASLD Department PTRM Committee Chair

The PTRM chairperson heads both the promotion and tenure (P&T) Committee, and the Reappointment and Merit (RM) Committee. The chair will be elected for a 3-year

term from the ranks of tenured faculty members. Individuals cannot serve more than two consecutive 3-year terms as committee chair. When needed, elections will take place in April at a department meeting. Elections will be held by written secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member and tallied by the department chair. The chair assumes office in June of that year. The chair is responsible for:

- a) Guiding the promotion and tenure process and insuring that the policies outlined in this document are followed.
- b) Organizing and chairing all relevant committee meetings.
- c) Insuring the completion of documentation and securing necessary signatures.
- d) Recording the vote count for all deliberations.
- e) Developing and distributing the faculty peer evaluation schedule and tracking the completion of peer evaluations
- f) Reviewing the department P&T documents and submitting possible changes to the department chairperson.
- g) Conducting a P&T information seminar to all faculty in the spring semester as part of the first faculty meeting in May.
- h) Designate a member of the committee to take minutes and attendance at the P&T committee meetings and the RM committee meetings, and disseminate these minutes to committee members and the department chairperson.

3. ASLD Department P&T Committee

The ASLD P&T Committee is responsible for: (1) making all tenure recommendations, (2) promotion recommendations for tenured and tenure-track faculty; and (3) recommendations for reappointment of tenure-track faculty.

- a) Composition of the P&T Committee
 - i. The P&T Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members in the department. Faculty members must attend all deliberations to vote.
 - ii. Tenured faculty members on sabbatical or medical leave are excused from Tenure and Promotion Committee meetings and cannot vote unless they attend deliberations.
 - iii. In the case where there are fewer than 3 tenured faculty members, the department will supplement the committee with tenured faculty members from other departments for a minimum of 3 faculty on the committee (excluding the

department chair). The additional faculty will be selected from a list of at least 3 recommended by the faculty member under review. The faculty member must submit the list to the department chairperson on or before the third Friday in June. The department chair and Dean will review the list and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The CHP P&T Committee will then select member(s) to be added by the third Friday of September.

- iv. The department chair shall attend P&T Committee meetings and participate in tenure, promotion, and re-appointment discussions but cannot serve as a voting member of the committee.

b) Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

The P&T Committee is responsible for:

- i. Reviewing requests for promotion, tenure, 3-year comprehensive reappointment reviews, and 5-year comprehensive reviews.
- ii. Reviewing the Portfolios submitted by faculty members and comparing them to annual reports, workload agreements, and Curriculum Vitae.
- iii. Comparing planned workload agreements to accomplishments over the period of review.
- iv. Attending all meetings of the P&T Committee.
- v. Making promotion, tenure, and reappointment recommendations based on the guidelines outlined in this document.
- vi. Completing comprehensive 5-year reviews based on the guidelines in this document.
- vii. As a group, preparing a report for each tenured or tenure-track faculty member outlining advancement towards promotion and/or tenure, and the reasons behind the recommendation. All committee members must sign the report.
- viii. As a group, preparing a report for each faculty member outlining the committee's recommendation and the reasons behind the recommendation. The report must contain recommendations for each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. All committee members must sign the report.
- ix. Completing all required forms supplied to the ASLD P&T committee by the provost of the university.

- x. The Department Chair will compose a separate evaluation report for each faculty member following the guidelines outlined in the Towson University ART Appendix 3.
4. ASLD Department Reappointment and Merit (RM) Committee
The RM Committee is responsible for Reappointment recommendations for clinical faculty and lecturers. The RM Committee is also responsible for Clinical Faculty Promotion recommendations, clinical faculty multi-year review recommendations and Merit recommendations for all faculty.

a) Composition of the RM Committee

The RM Committee is composed of the following 5 voting members:

- i. Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson (3-year elected term).
- ii. Four tenured faculty, or tenure-track faculty in their fourth year or later. At least two of the four members must be tenured. Faculty are appointed for 2-year rotating terms.
- iii. The department chair shall attend the RM committee meetings and participate in these discussions, but cannot serve as a voting member of the department RM committee.
- iv. Department-level evaluation of clinical faculty and lecturers for reappointment and merit will include the addition of one clinical faculty member at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor or higher who has a multi-year contract (or three or more consecutive one-year contracts). Clinical faculty on such committees are voting members.

b) Responsibilities of the RM Committee

The RM Committee is responsible for:

- i. Making recommendations for reappointment of clinical, lecturer, and visiting faculty, determining merit for all faculty, promotion recommendations for clinical faculty, and multi-year contract review and promotions for clinical faculty.
- ii. Reviewing the Portfolios submitted by faculty members and comparing them to the Annual Report Part I, Annual Review Part II Workload Agreement, and Curriculum Vitae.
- iii. Attending all meetings of the RM Committee.

- iv. Making reappointment and merit recommendations based on the faculty members approved workload agreement for the previous year, and the guidelines outlined in this document.
- v. As a group, preparing a report for each clinical faculty and lecturer outlining reappointment and recommendations and the reasons behind them. All committee members present for the vote must sign the report.
- vi. As a group, preparing a report for all faculty outlining merit recommendations and the reasons behind them. All committee members present for the vote must sign the report.
- vii. As a group, preparing reports for clinical faculty who are reviewed for promotion and/or multi-year contract. A promotion report should specify the promotion recommendation and reasons behind the recommendation. A multi-year contract report should include the recommendation and justification for the recommendation. All committee members present for the vote must sign the report(s).
- viii. The department chair will prepare a separate report for all faculty considered for promotion, tenure, and/or multi-year contracts.
- ix. The department chair may prepare an independent merit or re-appointment recommendation report for faculty.
- x. The committee will prepare the Department Summary Recommendation, or alternate form as specified by the provost, for each faculty member reviewed.
- xi. The department chair will meet with all faculty members periodically during the academic year to discuss their annual report, student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the department's RM Committee recommendations, and annual faculty evaluation. All letters will be delivered in person and the chairperson will meet with faculty as requested to discuss the recommendation.

D. Committee Policies and Procedures

1. Absent Members and Quorums

- a) A quorum for the P&T Committee consists of a minimum of 3 tenured faculty members, and a minimum of 75% of all tenured faculty in the department.
- b) A quorum for the Reappointment and Merit Committee consists of a minimum of 4 voting committee members.
- c) All faculty who wish to vote must participate in all committee meetings and deliberations. Faculty members who are unable to do so will be removed from

the committee and replaced with the next appointed member in the rotation sequence.

- d) All committee members must vote. No committee member shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes the abstention. When faculty have a professional or familial conflict of interest, they must disclose the conflict and seek authorization for the abstention

2. Committee Schedule and Deadlines

- a) The P&T Committee will complete individual faculty tenure and promotion recommendations before the RM deliberations.
- b) Committee members are notified by the end of the preceding spring semester. Committee deliberations will begin after August 20th and end by the last Friday in September.
- c) Reports for reappointment, promotion, tenure, comprehensive review, annual review and/or merit must be signed and delivered to respective faculty members by the second Friday of October.
- d) Negative reappointment, comprehensive review, promotion and tenure recommendations will be delivered in-person by the department chair or sent by certified letter to the faculty member's home address.
- e) All Promotion, Tenure and 5-year Review materials are forwarded to the CHP Dean's Office by the second Friday in November.
- f) The RM committee will hold reappointment meetings for first year faculty and deliver recommendation letters to the faculty member by the third Friday in January.
- g) The P&T Committee will conduct third year reviews for tenure track faculty by the third week in January and deliver recommendation letters to the faculty member by the second week in February. The department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review no later than the first Friday in March.
- h) Department chair meetings to discuss P&T Committee or RM Committee recommendations will take place no later than the second Friday in November for fall recommendations, and the second Friday in February for spring recommendations.
- i) If the University or CHP PTRM Calendar is revised, the department committee will revise the Department's calendar accordingly.

3. Meeting Policies

- a) All P&T and RM committee deliberations are confidential.
- b) All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair.
- c) The committee chair 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.
- d) No committee member shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
- e) Documentation under review will include the portfolio(s) provided by the faculty member and additional documentation provided by the department chairperson regarding teaching, scholarship, and/or service productivity. All additional information provided by the chairperson must be communicated, either verbally or in writing, to the faculty member under review according to the procedures outlined in section II.B, unless an examination of the information in the faculty portfolio results in the need for additional clarification/documentation from the chairperson during the meeting or if a faculty member has falsified or selectively omitted required documentation in the areas of teaching, advising, scholarship, or service. Any additional information provided to the committee by the chairperson must be communicated to the faculty member.
- f) All votes are based on simple majority. In the event of a tie vote for any tenure, promotion, reappointment, and/or merit recommendations, the discussion will be reopened and members will vote a second time. Subsequent tie votes for any tenure, promotion, reappointment, and/or merit recommendations are considered negative recommendations.
- g) Merit recommendations must record separate votes for each of three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Tie votes will be counted as recommendations for the lower of any merit levels under consideration. The actual vote count will be included in all committee letters.

E. Faculty Appeals

Faculty who disagree with negative reappointment, promotion, tenure or merit recommendations should immediately discuss their concerns with the Department Chair as well as follow the department and University guidelines from the TU ART document.

1. Negative Recommendations

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. The chair has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the departmental level and the dean has responsibility for conveyance of any recommendation made at the college level. The Provost has responsibility for conveyance of any decision rendered by the Provost. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are to be distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

2. Appeals

Faculty who receive base merit may not appeal the merit decision. Faculty who agree with the department tenure, promotion, or annual merit recommendations, but disagree with wording in the letters that outline the recommendations, may write a rebuttal to the letter and submit it to the PTRM chair within 30 days of receiving the letter. This should be clearly indicated as a rebuttal and not an appeal. The letter will then be placed on file in the department and will be forwarded to the CHP dean's office with the original committee letter as part of the ASLD P&T document submission process. Faculty may not ask for revisions to the original letters. Exceptions may be considered for typographical errors that significantly affect the content of the letter.

There are three (3) types of appeals:

- a) Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either department and/or college PTRM committees, the department chairperson, the dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
 - i. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the college PTRM, dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.
 - ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.
 - iii. Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean and the college PTRM committee.

- iv. All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review in the information added section no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM committee chair.
 - v. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the college PTRM committee, the university PTRM committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - vi. Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.
- b) Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
- i. Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM committee.
 - ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.
 - iii. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the dean and the university PTRM committee chair.
 - iv. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the university PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - v. Recommendations of the university PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the university PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.
- c) Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 –Prohibiting

Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

F. Changes to Promotion and Tenure Expectations and Policies

All changes to the Department's Promotion and Tenure Expectations and Policies must be approved by the department and forwarded to the CHP P&T Committee by the first Friday in December. Changes can be voted on by all tenured, and tenure-track faculty. Clinical faculty and lecturers may participate in discussions related to changing the document but may not vote. A quorum will consist of 2/3rds of the eligible faculty. Changes are approved by simple majority vote.

IV. Faculty Evaluation for Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty are evaluated for different reasons. These include re-appointment, annual review/merit, tenure, promotion, 3-year, and 5-year comprehensive reviews. Each type of evaluation has different components and standards that must be considered. Faculty who have met the university requirements for consideration for promotion to adjunct II will be asked to submit a review portfolio following university time-lines for adjunct promotion. The promotion and tenure committee will review the portfolio and make a recommendation based on the university criteria.

A. Reappointment Recommendations

All tenure-track or clinical faculty reviewed for reappointment must meet the standards outlined in this document and, in addition, must meet standards outlined in the *Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Addendum A: Towson University Guidelines for Developmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service*. ASLD procedures for Clinical Faculty follow the College of Health Professions Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit. ASLD procedures for lecturers follow the Towson University policy on the Employment of Lecturers (02-01.05).

1. One-year reappointment recommendations
 - a) First and Second Year Faculty Reappointment Recommendations: Faculty must meet listed criteria in the areas of (a) appropriate degree and (b) teaching effectiveness, to be approved for reappointment.
 - b) Third to Sixth Year Faculty Reappointment Recommendations: Faculty must meet all reappointment criteria.
 - c) Clinical instructors may be reappointed for one-year contracts only.
2. Multi-year contract recommendations for clinical faculty
 - a) Initial three-year contracts

- b) Upon request by the clinical faculty member, he/she may be considered for a three-year contract as follows:
- i. The clinical faculty member at least meets the following college-level criteria: has had three consecutive positive annual reviews of performance in the immediate past three years as a clinical faculty member by both the department committee and department chairperson. Positive annual reviews include at least satisfactory performance in all three aspects of the clinical faculty role and evidence of sustained clinical/professional excellence.
 - ii. The Clinical Faculty member must request review for consideration of a three-year contract at least by the third Friday in September in the year prior to beginning of the three-year contract.
 - iii. The Clinical Faculty member submits a summative evaluation portfolio reflecting accomplishments in teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and evidence of ongoing Clinical/Professional Excellence. The portfolio is organized as set forth in the TU ART document.
 - iv. The department RM committee and department chairperson may recommend reappointment for a three-year contract based on the criteria in the TU ART document and department-based criteria. Recommendation is also based on department need as noted in the TU ART document.
 - v. A three-year contract requires a positive recommendation of both the department RM Committee and the Department Chairperson. The Dean of the College also must support a recommendation of a three-year contract prior to the request being forwarded to the Provost. Three-year contracts are granted upon approval of the Provost.
3. Subsequent three-year contracts:

To request review for subsequent three-year contracts after the initial three-year contract, the clinical faculty member submits a summative evaluation portfolio by the second Friday of January of the second year (following the format of materials to submit for a comprehensive five-year review for tenured faculty). The summative evaluation content will follow the same guidelines as the comprehensive five-year review for tenured faculty. The portfolio is organized as set forth in section I.B.3.e of the TU ART Policy. A three-year contract requires a positive recommendation of both the RM committee and the Department Chairperson.

B. Reappointment Criteria

1. Faculty must possess the appropriate degree. Tenure-track or tenured faculty must possess the doctoral degree. Tenure-track faculty who begin without this degree must complete it by the date listed in their initial contract. Depending on the level at

which instructors, lecturers, or clinical faculty are hired, the following is a description of the necessary degree as well as the clinical/professional experience necessary for each level.

a) Assistant Instructor or Lecturer:

Appointment at the Assistant Instructor or Lecturer rank requires a minimum of:

- i. A Master's Degree in the appropriate field, and where appropriate, certification and/or licensure in the field.
- ii. Clinical or professional experience in the area of the discipline in which the appointment is being made.
- iii. Evidence of currency in professional or clinical practice,
- iv. Demonstrated effectiveness in professional/clinical teaching ability in the discipline.

b) Clinical Assistant Professor

Appointment at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank requires a minimum of:

- i. A master's degree in the field and, where appropriate, certification and/or licensure in the field,
- ii. Three years of clinical/professional experience in the area of the discipline in which the appointment is being made and evidence of currency in clinical/professional practice, and
- iii. Demonstrated effectiveness in clinical/professional teaching ability in the discipline.
- iv. participation in mentoring activities to support effective teaching and/or advising

c) Clinical Associate Professor

Appointment at the Clinical Associate Professor rank requires:

- i. The qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor,
- ii. Evidence of extensive successful experience in clinical/ professional practice in a field of specialization within the discipline and in working with and/or directing other (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students) in clinical/professional activities in the field,
- iii. Evidence of a substantial history of effective clinical teaching ability, and either scholarly or administrative accomplishments in or related to the clinical program, and

- iv. Evidence of effective and substantial service to the institution, the community, and the profession.
 - v. continued effective and successful participation in student advising
 - vi. continued participation in mentoring activities to support effective teaching and/or advising
- d) Clinical Professor
Appointment at the Clinical Professor rank requires:
- i. The qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor, Evidence of excellence in clinical/professional practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding regional and national reputation among colleagues,
 - ii. A sustained record of excellence in teaching and advising
 - iii. Evidence of sustained scholarly competence and leadership in the profession,
 - iv. Continuing evidence of effective and substantial service to the institution, the community, and the profession, and
 - v. An earned doctoral degree.

2. Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated for all faculty reappointment recommendations. Teaching effectiveness is described in Appendix E.

3. Scholarly Growth

Scholarly growth for reappointment recommendations is demonstrated by the items listed below, which depend on faculty appointment type.

a) Tenure-Track Faculty

- i. New research or knowledge that is shared with the profession through presentations and/or publications.
- ii. Progress in developing new research initiatives for current and future scholarly endeavors that move beyond the dissertation or move beyond research completed prior to hiring at Towson University.

b) Instructors, Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

- i. The ability to integrate current knowledge into teaching and/or clinical supervision experiences.
- ii. A record of continuing education related to the discipline, profession, and/or teaching pedagogy.
- iii. Where appropriate, continuing education to earn and maintain certification and/or licensure.

4. Service

Service to the Department, College, University and Community for reappointment recommendations is demonstrated by

a) Continuous and collegial involvement in committees and other activities of the Department, College and University.

b) University and/or Community Involvement as demonstrated by one or both of the following

- i. Committee activities that extend beyond the required expectations of all faculty members. For example taking a leadership role within a committee, organizing an event, etc. Required activities for all faculty include, but are not limited to: attending graduation once per year (per available space), attending all department faculty and program meetings, proctoring/grading of graduate student comprehensive exams, and attendance at graduate student orientation and department graduation activities.
- ii. Participation in community-related activities that rely on the faculty member's professional area of expertise. This can take the form of community training, assistance, civic engagement activities, leadership roles within professional groups, or other professional service roles or activities.

C. Tenure and/or Promotion Recommendations for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

All tenured and tenure-track faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion must meet the standards outlined in the *Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (ART)*, *ART Appendix 3*, and the *College of Health Professions Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures*. Tenure and/or Promotion recommendations are made by the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee.

1. University Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

a) The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University are indicated in the Towson University ART document and are listed as follows:

- a) teaching effectiveness,
 - b) research,
 - c) scholarship,
 - d) in appropriate areas, creative activities;
 - e) service to the community, profession, and University. The relative weight of these criteria is determined by the University's mission and reflected in faculty workload assignments.
- b) The activities considered to be within the criteria for promotion and tenure shall be flexible and expansive. The assessment of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service during the promotion and tenure process shall give appropriate recognition, consistent with the University's mission, to faculty accomplishments that are collaborative, interdisciplinary, and inter-institutional and to faculty innovations in areas such as undergraduate education, minority-achievement programs, K-16 curriculum development, and technology-enhanced learning, all as more fully described in section XVII.C. of Appendix 3.
- c) The University has written procedures governing the promotion and tenure process (the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations: Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review, Appendix 3). The Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation may be amended from time to time, without the need to amend this Policy, by the Office of the Provost, in consultation with the University Senate, subject to the approval of the President and the Office of the Attorney General. If the Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation are amended, a copy of the new Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation will be filed in the office of the Chancellor, and shall replace the original Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation.

2. ASLD Department Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

a) Workload profiles

Faculty expectations for promotion and/or tenure are linked to workload agreements for the time-span under review and are categorized as follows:

- i. Scholar-Teacher Faculty
 - Average scholarship percentage over the period of review of 25% or higher.

- Limited to tenured or tenure-track faculty.
 - Workload profile will vary based on the balance between teaching and service obligations, but may look like this: Teaching = 60%; Scholarship = 25% - 30%; Service = 10% - 15%
- ii. Teacher-Scholar Faculty
- Average scholarship percentage over the period of review of 15-20%.
 - Workload profile will vary based on the balance between teaching and service obligations, but may look like this: Teaching = 60-70%; Scholarship = 15% - 20%; Service = 10% - 20%*
- iii. Dedicated Teacher Faculty
- Average scholarship percentage over the period of review of 10%.
 - The standard workload profile for clinical faculty and lecturers.
 - Workload profile will vary based on the balance between teaching and service obligations, but may look like this: Teaching = 70-80%; Scholarship = 10%; Service = 10-20%*

*20% service is generally only allowed for faculty with director or coordinator roles.

b) Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure

Faculty at the Associate Professor level must demonstrate effective teaching and demonstrate success in research, scholarship, and where appropriate, be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of 6 years of full-time university/college teaching. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research. There shall also be evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession.

- i. Teaching Effectiveness
- Effective teaching, as described in Appendix E.
- ii. Scholarship expectations
- Scholarship expectations vary with the workload expectations of the faculty member. In order to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to associate or full professor, faculty are expected to meet the criteria for their assigned workload. Please refer to the minimum guidelines for promotion in the CHP PTRM document and ART. Specific ASLD criteria for scholarship are available in Appendix C. All candidates need to demonstrate a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda that reflects one or more of the Boyer Model forms of scholarship. The candidate's scholarship shall reflect the depth and breadth in agenda and focus. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the intellectual

rigor, validity, dissemination, and quality of their scholarly work. Examples include journal rankings, peer review comments, journal or presentation acceptance rates, citations by others, and reviews of published work. For all publications or grants, faculty members who are not the first, second, or third author, need to submit a brief description outlining their contribution to the piece.

iii. Service

- Service to the Department, College, University and Community is demonstrated by the items listed below. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate how their service activities required leadership, effort, and/or commitment.
 - A record of 3 or more years of sustained collegial involvement in committees and other activities of the Department, College and/or University.
 - Committee or university activities that extend beyond the routine expectations of all faculty members. For example taking a leadership role within a committee, organizing an event, taking on a substantial task for the department, etc.
 - Recognition by others of the quality and impact of service contributions to Towson University.
 - Contributions to professional and/or community organizations or associations based on discipline expertise that go beyond the level of simply being a member.
 - Recognition by others of the quality and impact of professional and/or community service.

c) Standards for Promotion to Professor

Faculty at the Professor level must have established an outstanding record of effective teaching and research/scholarship. A Professor must have a minimum of 10 years of full-time university/college teaching. Rare exceptions may be made for faculty who have attained national distinction for comparable professional activity or research. There shall be continuing evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession. Candidates for promotion to Professor must also demonstrate evidence of a national reputation in their area of study, which can take the form of peer-reviewed publications and presentations, and significant professional leadership roles. When external reviews are solicited, protocol will follow the guidelines set forth by the provost. Additional faculty expectations for promotion and/or tenure are linked to workload agreements for the time-span under review and are categorized as follows:

i. Teaching effectiveness

- Effective in teaching as described in Appendix E.
- A record of mentoring colleagues in the teaching or advising process, particularly junior faculty.

- Demonstrate leadership in an aspect of teaching and/or advising.

ii. Scholarship

Scholarship expectations vary with the workload expectations of the faculty member. In order to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to Professor, faculty are expected to meet the criteria for their assigned workload and demonstrate a national reputation in their area of study. In general, faculty need to be able to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship. Scholarly contributions must involve substantive peer review, and faculty must demonstrate efforts to obtain external funding to support scholarship or creative agendas. See the Scholarship Criteria Appendix G for the criteria. All candidates need to demonstrate a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda that reflects one or more of the Boyer Model forms of scholarship. The candidate's scholarship shall reflect the depth and breadth in agenda and focus. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the intellectual rigor, validity, dissemination, and quality of their scholarly work. Examples include journal rankings, peer review comments, journal or presentation acceptance rates, citations, and peer reviews of published work. For all publications or grants, faculty members who are not the first, second, or third author, need to submit a brief description outlining their contribution to the piece.

In addition to the items in Appendix C, the following additional criteria must be achieved for promotion to Professor.

- Mentoring graduate and/or undergraduate students in research opportunities.
- Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in their scholarship activities.
- Demonstrated leadership in mentoring junior faculty or other faculty in scholarly activities.

* Note: Towson University FDRC internal grants or non peer-reviewed journals do not count as substantial scholarly contributions required for promotion to Professor.

iii. Service

Service to the Department, College, University and Community is demonstrated by:

- A record of sustained collegial service to the University at department/college, or higher university levels over the past 5 years or since the last promotion (whichever timeframe is shorter).
- Substantive leadership in the role at the department level as well as at either the College, University, Community, or Profession. Leadership is defined as a process in which an individual provides direction and leads others in the accomplishment of a goal. Faculty members should provide evidence of the accomplishments associated with their leadership role.

Leadership assumes the individual will effect change and make a positive impact on the department, college, or university and upon students, faculty, community, or profession, Examples including chairing, directing, coordinating or presiding over committees, programs, outreach efforts, departments, boards that create or substantially revise policies, procedures, curriculum, teaching, and so forth. The individual must demonstrate that they provided leadership that created positive change for students, faculty, the community, and/or the profession.

- Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in their service activities.

d) General Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty:

- i. Clinical faculty at all ranks (except Clinical Professor) are eligible for review for promotion.
- ii. The minimum number of years in rank is six years full-time University teaching for Clinical Associate Professors and a minimum of ten years for Clinical Professor. Review will normally occur no earlier than the sixth-year in a clinical faculty position.
- iii. Three-year contracts are not included with promotion decisions and need to be requested by the faculty member.
- iv. The department RM Committee and the department chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion.
- v. Promotion recommendations are also made by the College PTRM Committee and the College Dean.
- vi. Promotions are approved by the Provost.
- vii. Scholarly activities for clinical faculty should reasonably align with the clinical/professional areas of expertise and responsibilities, be predominantly clinically/professionally-based and be disseminated and validated. Scholarship may take on many different forms for the Clinical Faculty member and as stated in the TU ART policy may include:
 - Scholarship of Application – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.
 - Scholarship of Discovery – conducting traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.
 - Scholarship of Integration – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
 - Scholarship of Teaching – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the

teacher's understanding and the student's learning. (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998).

viii. Clinical faculty are expected over time to develop a record of service that reflects contributions to the institution and the profession/discipline and/or the community. Service to the institution includes involvement in faculty governance at the program and department level and at the college and/or university level. The nature and extent of involvement in service at the college and university level will be dictated in part by opportunities for committee involvement, professional expertise, and institutional need.

e) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor

For promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor, the following standards for teaching, scholarship, and service apply:

i. Teaching/Advising:

- Effective teaching as described in Appendix I and in the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit (2013).

ii. Scholarship

- A clearly defined area of expertise that can be developed into a scholarship plan that reflects the potential for ongoing growth in the designated area of expertise.
- Currency in the knowledge based supporting one's designated area of expertise that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.
- Integration and application of one's professional scholarly activities to teaching or service or other professional activities.
- Begin and continue over time dissemination of one's scholarly activities in one's area of expertise.

iii. Service

- Involvement in faculty governance at the department level (faculty member may also be involved at the college or university level)
- service contributions to the institution and/or profession and/or community that draws upon one's professional expertise
- Recognition of the quality and impact of one's service.

f) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant Professor, for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, the following standards for teaching, scholarship, and service also apply:

i. Teaching/Advising

- Effective teaching as described in Appendix I and in the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit (2013).
- ii. Scholarship
- Demonstrated evidence that one's scholarship plan has matured over time.
 - Currency in the knowledge base supporting one's designated area of expertise that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.
 - Integration and application of one's professional scholarly activities to teaching and service or other professional activities.
 - Demonstrated continued dissemination of one's scholarly activities in one's area of expertise.
 - Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship.
- iii. Service
- In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant professor, the following standards must be met for promotion to Clinical Associate professor:
- Service contributions to the institution and the community should draw upon one's professional expertise;
 - Advocacy in addressing important issues or needs in faculty governance at the department level and college and/or university level and/or profession and/or community level.
 - Recognition of the quality and impact of one's service contributions.
- g) Standards for Promotion to Clinical Professor
- In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Associate Professor, an earned doctoral degree is required for promotion to the Clinical Professor rank. In addition, the following standards for teaching, scholarship, and service also apply:
- i. Teaching/Advising
- Effective teaching as described in Appendix I and in the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit (2013).
 - Effective mentoring of colleagues in the area of teaching.
 - External validation of their clinical expertise at the regional level or higher.
- ii. Scholarship
- A sustained record of scholarship activity within one's designated area of expertise that is validated and disseminated to the professional community.
 - Currency in the knowledge base supporting one's designated area of expertise; that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.
 - A sustained record of integration and application of one's professional scholarly activities to teaching and service or other professional activities.
 - Demonstrated continued dissemination of one's scholarly activities in one's area of expertise.
 - Distinction in the quality of one's scholarship.

- Excellence in mentoring faculty, clinical practitioners, or students in their efforts to integrate or generate new knowledge in the field.
- iii. Service
- Demonstrated leadership in addressing important institutional, professional, or community issues;
 - Distinction in the quality of one's service at multiple levels of faculty governance (department and college and/or university) and profession and/or community
 - Mentoring of colleagues.
 - a sustained record of service activity in faculty governance at the department and college and/or university levels
 - advocacy in addressing important issues or needs
 - participation in mentoring of colleagues within the department
- h) Examples and evidence for a clinical faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with scholarship standards:
- i. A description of one's scholarship in their designated area of clinical expertise.
 - ii. Presenter of a juried presentation at a local, regional conference, national or international conference.
 - iii. An invited presenter at a local, regional conference, national or international conference.
 - iv. Participation in dissemination of clinical expertise via guest lecture, clinical in-service presentation or consultation.
 - v. Disseminated clinical expertise via regular and ongoing clinical consultation.
 - vi. Published reviews of scholarly works.
 - vii. Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others.
 - viii. Citation by others of one's scholarship.
 - ix. Creation of educational materials that demonstrate integration / synthesis of knowledge.
 - x. Creation of new workshops related to the designated area of clinical expertise.
 - xi. Participation or submission in a grant or grant application.
 - xii. Participation in clinical research.

- xiii. Writing technical reports and/or evidenced-based policy that reflects integration of knowledge.
- xiv. Developing and/or writing of monographs or technical reports for publication.
- xv. Developing a new case report related to the designated area of clinical expertise for dissemination.
- xvi. Publication of a case report related to the designated area of clinical expertise.
- xvii. Author or co-author of an article in a peer reviewed or practice journal or a book chapter.
- xviii. Awards and other recognition for the quality of one's scholarship.
- xix. External evaluations and reviews of one's work.

D. Third-Year Review

1. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the department P&T Committee will conduct a third-year review of tenure-track candidates. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. Department PTRM committee evaluations of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost.
2. Faculty members in their third year must submit a three-inch comprehensive portfolio by the second Friday in December. The P&T Committee will meet regarding the candidate and conclude deliberations by the second Friday in February. The P&T Committee is responsible for evaluating the progress of the faculty member in relationship to the standards for advancement to tenure and promotion to associate professor (if applicable) outlined in the ASLD and CHP PTRM documents as well as the ART.
3. The P&T Committee is responsible for providing an evaluation summary that includes assistance in addressing issues noted as shortcomings in the faculty member's efforts and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.
4. The letter prepared by the P&T Committee will include an evaluation of the submitted materials and will indicate whether or not the faculty member's work to date is expected to result in meeting the tenure and promotion criteria. The letter will

provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

5. The P&T Committee will decide, via majority vote, if the candidate is assessed as making superior, satisfactory, or not satisfactory progress.
 - a) Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship and meeting department standards in service.
 - b) Satisfactory progress. Requirements include effective teaching, satisfactory scholarly productivity, and satisfactory service such that the committee has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.
 - c) Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure recommendation.
6. Feedback to the candidate should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the department PTRM chairperson, no later than the first Friday in March. The Tenure and Promotion Committee letter will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Health Professions by the 3rd Friday in March.

E. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Process

Tenured faculty members must be evaluated every 5 years following the tenure decision, or 5 years after the last promotion decision. Comprehensive reviews are summative for the period of the preceding 5 years. Faculty with tenure who receive two consecutive “no merit” Annual Reviews are required to undergo a Comprehensive Review the next year. The P&T Committee is in charge of the evaluation process for Comprehensive Reviews. A negative Comprehensive Review will be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member’s failure to meet minimum professional expectations following procedures outlined in the ART Appendix 3 Document.

1. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Assistant Professor Rank

Faculty are evaluated using the standards for promotion to Assistant Professor to determine if they are maintaining department standards for rank. Scholarship will be evaluated based on the faculty members’ workload agreement and assigned teaching load. As part of the evaluation process, the Tenure and Promotion committee should also look forward and assess the faculty member’s ability to be promoted to the next level using the standards for promotion to Associate Professor.

2. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Associate Professor Rank

Faculty are evaluated using the standards for promotion to Associate Professor to determine if they are maintaining department standards for rank. Scholarship will be evaluated based on the faculty members' workload agreement and assigned teaching load. The Tenure and Promotion committee should also look forward and assess the faculty member's ability to be promoted to the next level using the standards for promotion to Professor.

3. Comprehensive Review of Faculty at the Professor Rank

Faculty are evaluated using the standards for promotion to Professor to determine if they are maintaining department standards for rank. Scholarship will be evaluated based on the faculty members' workload agreement and assigned teaching load.

V. Faculty Annual Review and Merit Recommendations

All faculty (tenured, tenure-track, clinical faculty, instructors, and lecturers) will be evaluated annually with the evaluation tied to merit recommendations. The RM Committee is in charge of these reviews. Faculty members are responsible for providing sufficient, organized documentation to support the merit recommendations of the committee. The criteria for merit for clinical faculty will follow department guidelines and be congruent with university standards and include an evaluation of clinical excellence.

A. Criteria for Department Merit Recommendations

Merit is evaluated separately in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Separate merit standards for each area are outlined below. The following categories will be used to evaluate merit within each of the three areas: "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," and "Excellent."

Overall merit recommendations will be determined as follows:

1. Needs Improvement: Faculty members who receive a rating of unsatisfactory in any of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Performance fails to adequately meet standards.
2. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Faculty members who receive a rating of no less than effective in teaching (Appendix I) and satisfactory in scholarship and service. Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, College, and Department.
3. Excellent (Base + Merit): Faculty members who receive a rating of no less than effective in teaching and satisfactory in scholarship and service and who receive a rating of excellent in at least two of the three categories of scholarship, service, and teaching.

B. Merit Criteria in the Area of Teaching

1. Needs Improvement in Teaching

The faculty member's teaching efforts failed to meet department standards for effective teaching (see Appendix I), or did not fulfill contractual or professional expectations.

2. Effective Teaching (Satisfactory)

See Appendix I.

3. Excellent Teaching

See Appendix I.

C. Merit Criteria in the Area of Scholarship

Merit in the area of scholarship will be directly tied to the agreement between the AR II (projected workload) and the AR I (actual workload). Annual Agreement Part II, Faculty Workload Agreement for the previous year. Faculty are grouped into one of three categories based on their teaching/scholarship/service workload. These are: (a) Scholar-Teacher (25% or higher scholarship); (b) Teacher-Scholar 15%-25% scholarship); (c) Dedicated Teacher (10% scholarship) Merit expectations in the area of scholarship are adjusted based on percentage of time dedicated in the individual Annual Workload Agreements. Although faculty will not be held to the specific items planned in the AR, substantive changes that occur within a revised workload plan may be an indication of lack of planning relative on the part of the faculty member. The amount of effort and significance of effort in the area of scholarship will be examined by the committees relative to the originally planned activities and should be of the same magnitude as the item stated on the workload expectations. For all publications or grants, faculty members who are not the first, second, or third author must get a letter of support from the first author explaining the contribution of the faculty member to the manuscript.

The Scholarship Criteria for Merit are outlined in Appendix D. Standards are based on the teaching/scholarship workload described below. Across all workload categories, the following definition for "Needs Improvement" applies:

Needs Improvement in Scholarship: The faculty member's scholarship efforts did not meet department standards for satisfactory work, or did not fulfill the expectations based on the Annual Agreement Part II, Faculty Workload Agreement for the previous year.

1. Scholar-Teacher Faculty (25- 30% scholarship effort)

- a) Satisfactory Scholarship is demonstrated by

- i. Documentation of the initiation or continuation of a research project.

- ii. Completing 3 points worth of scholarly activities excluding student independent studies (See Appendix D).

- b) Excellent Scholarship is demonstrated by either
 - i. Completing one substantial scholarly activity, as shown in the left column of Appendix H OR completing 6 points worth of scholarly activities from the middle and right columns of Appendix D.
- 2. Teacher-Scholar Faculty (20% scholarship effort)
 - a) Satisfactory Scholarship is demonstrated by
 - i. Documentation of the initiation or continuation of a research project.
 - ii. Completing 2 points of scholarly activities excluding student independent studies (See Appendix D).
 - b) Excellent Scholarship is demonstrated by either
 - i. Completing one substantial scholarly activity OR completing 4 points worth of scholarly activities, which could include 2 points for student independent studies (See Appendix D).
- 3. Dedicated Teacher Faculty (8-course load) (\cong 10% scholarship effort)
 - a) Satisfactory Scholarship is demonstrated by
 - i. Documentation of the initiation or continuation of a research project.
 - ii. Completing 1 point of scholarly activities excluding student independent studies (See Appendix D).
 - b) Excellent Scholarship is demonstrated by either
 - i. Completing one substantial scholarly activity OR, completing 2 points of scholarly activities including student independent studies, which could include 2 points for student independent studies (See Appendix D).
- 4. Clinical Faculty, Instructors and Lecturers (8-course load) (\cong 10% scholarship effort)
 - a) Satisfactory Scholarship is demonstrated by
 - i. Evidence of incorporating new professional knowledge into teaching and/or supervision.
 - ii. When required, meets continuing education requirements for licensure.

- iii. Ongoing excellence in clinical area.
 - iv. Clinical associate professors are required to complete 1 point of scholarly activities including student independent studies to be considered for satisfactory scholarship (See Appendix D).
- b) Excellent Scholarship is demonstrated by either
- i. Completing one substantial scholarly activity OR completing 1 point of scholarly activities including student independent studies (clinical faculty only) (See Appendix D).
 - ii. Clinical associate professors are required to complete 2 points of scholarly activities including student independent studies to be considered for excellent scholarship (See Appendix D).

D. Merit in the Area of Service

1. Needs Improvement in Service

The faculty member did not meet workload expectations in the area of service and/or the service efforts did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.

2. Satisfactory Service

The faculty member's service performance met workload expectations and department standards. The faculty member contributed positively and meaningfully to the service needs of the university, community or profession by meeting the following standards for satisfactory service.

5-10% service:

- a) The faculty member contributed to the department in a collegial manner.
- b) The faculty member contributed to the department by attending required department meetings, commencement, department open house activities, and other regular department activities.
- c) The faculty member contributed to the department by attending and participating in required clinical meetings and events (e.g., open house events, outreach events).
- d) The faculty member actively contributed at the program level (e.g., comprehensive examinations, open house events).
- e) The faculty member actively participated on two department, college, university, professional, or community committees or activities.

- f) Served as a faculty advisor or mentor for a student group at Towson or within the discipline.

15-20% service:

- a) Meets all expectation for satisfactory for 5-10% service and in addition:
- b) Meets one of the following:
- i. Has a substantial assigned leadership role that is accomplished in a satisfactory manner (e.g., chairperson, program director/coordinator).
 - ii. Has a leadership or unusually time-consuming role in two or more committees, boards, or activities (e.g., P&T committee, CHP Curriculum committee)
 - iii. Served as a faculty advisor or mentor for a student group at Towson or within the discipline 25% or more:
 - iv. Demonstrates satisfactory leadership and problem solving. (25% or higher is reserved for chairs or IWB director).
 - v. Mentors junior faculty in administrative tasks.

3. Excellent Service

The faculty member's service activities were diverse and beyond the expectations needed for a satisfactory merit rating.

- a) Instructors Assistant Professors should accomplish at least 1 of the items from column A or B below.
- b) Associate Professors should accomplish at least 2 of the following and Professors should accomplish at least 2 of the following. For Professors, one item must be from category A.
- i. Category A (Service Leadership)
 - Held a leadership position on one or more department, college, or university level committees or task forces (e.g., search committee chairperson, P&T chair, program director).
 - Held a leadership position in a professional or community organization that required the faculty member's professional expertise.
 - Served as a faculty advisor or mentor for a student group at Towson or within the discipline.
 - Awarded an internal or external grant or contract for service-learning or community events.

- Provided leadership for a difficult and/or essential task that resolved critical issues for the department, college, or university.
 - Provided leadership for a difficult and essential task that resolved critical issues for the discipline within professional groups or the community.
- ii. Category B (Service participation)
- Actively participated on two or more committees at the following levels:
 - department (can only count 1 committee at this level),
 - College or university (can count 2 or more at this level).
 - Held a position in a professional or community organization that required the faculty member's professional expertise.
 - Provided professional consulting or expertise to a professional or community organization or group.
 - Organized service-learning activities for students in the department, college or university.
 - Submitted an internal or external grant or contract to obtain funding for service-learning or community events.

VI. Department Methods of Evaluating, Teaching, Advising, Supervision, and Administration

The department uses several methods to document teaching, advising, administrative and supervision effectiveness. These are described below.

A. Peer Evaluations

All faculty must be observed teaching by their peers. The Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson will prepare a schedule of peer evaluations by September 15th for the current academic year and distribute the schedule to all faculty members. When possible, the peer evaluators assigned to observe a particular faculty member should rotate each year.

1. Qualifications of Faculty Peer Evaluators

Faculty who are tenured, or faculty who have completed 3 years of full-time employment in tenure-track or clinical faculty positions, can be peer observers.

2. Frequency of Peer Evaluations

At minimum, faculty are scheduled to be evaluated at least once per year. Faculty who are new, who are up for promotion and/or tenure, or a comprehensive review, are evaluated according to the guidelines listed below. Faculty can be visited more frequently, than listed below, but not less frequently.

a) Tenured Faculty: One visit per year. Faculty being considered for promotion or 5-year comprehensive review will be visited twice the year prior to the review. Both visits must be from faculty who are tenured. Professors who are tenured are exempt from being observed teaching by their peers if they meet the following criteria: have been teaching at TU for at least 10 years and have been evaluated at least 20 times, with 90% of the evaluations receiving a rating of "excellent".

b) Tenure-Track Faculty:

- i. First Year of Employment: 2 visits each semester (4 total). The first two visits must take place before October 30th. The department chair must be one of the peer evaluators during the first semester, all other observations must be from tenured or tenure-track faculty in their fourth year or later.
- ii. Years Two, Three, and Four: 1 visit each semester (2 total). Observations can be made by tenured or tenure-track faculty in their fourth year or later.
- iii. Year Five, or the Year Prior to Promotion and/or Tenure Decision: 4 visits during the year. All peer evaluators must be tenured faculty.
- iv. Year Six: 1 visit per year.

c) Clinical Faculty: clinical faculty can be observed during didactic teaching or clinical supervision. The respective clinic director must complete at least one of the peer evaluations during the first three years. If the clinical faculty member is not engaged in clinical supervision, then the clinic director will be replaced by another faculty member. Clinical faculty can be observed by tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty in their 4th year or beyond, or clinical faculty in their 4th year or beyond.

- i. First Year of Employment: 2 Visits each semester (4 total)
- ii. Years Two and Three: 1 visit each semester (2total)
- iii. All subsequent years: 1 visit per year.
- iv. The Year Prior to Promotion Decision: 4 visits during the year.

d) Visiting Faculty, Lecturers and Instructors: Lecturers, Instructors, and visiting Faculty will receive peer evaluations for merit and reappointment decisions. These observations can be completed by tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty in their 4th year or beyond, clinical faculty in their 4th year or beyond, or lecturers and instructors in their 4th year or beyond.

- i. First Year of employment: twice each semester (4 visits total).
- ii. Second and Third Year of employment: once each semester (2 visits total)
- iii. All Other Years: once per year

e) Adjuncts: Adjuncts will be peer reviewed to determine if they should be given future contracts to teach or provide clinical supervision. Adjuncts who supervise clinical practicum will be observed by the respective clinic director and/or by a clinical faculty member who primarily engages in supervision. Adjuncts who teach will

be observed by tenured, tenure-track, clinical or lecturer/instructor faculty who teach in the same program area.

- i. First Year of Employment: once each semester (2 visits total).
- ii. All other Years: once each year. (1 visit total).

3. Peer Evaluation Process

- a) Peer evaluators will notify the faculty member being observed at least one week in advance of the visit.
- b) The faculty member being observed will provide the peer evaluator with a copy of the syllabus attached to the new ASLD Syllabus Currency Form (AY 2009-2010). In addition, all student handouts or other materials for the class being observed must be provided to the observer. This can occur prior to class or when the peer evaluator arrives.
- c) The peer evaluator will observe the class for a minimum of 50 minutes but can stay longer.
- d) The peer evaluator will complete the Faculty Evaluation Class Observation Report and sign all three copies. A narrative statement can be attached to the form if needed. The form must be given to the faculty member being observed within 1 week of the visit.
- e) The faculty member being observed signs the form and keeps the white copy. This form must be included in portfolio documents. Signing the form indicates that the faculty member has received a copy; it does not indicate that the faculty member agrees with the evaluation. Faculty members who disagree with the evaluation can write a letter of dissent and attach it to all three copies of the peer evaluation.
- f) The other two copies of the form are turned into the P&T Committee Chair, or their designee.
- g) The P&T Committee Chair returns one of the two remaining copies back to the peer evaluator for their files.
- h) All copies of the Faculty Review for Syllabus Currency form are submitted to the P&T Committee Chairperson.
- i) If an instructor receives an unfavorable peer evaluation, or if the Department Chair receives numerous and repeated student concerns about the quality of instruction, the P&T Committee Chair will notify the faculty member and assign two additional peer visitations. The Department Chair will complete one of the two visits. These additional visits will be unannounced.

B. Student Evaluation of Courses

A single online course evaluation instrument has been developed by the University and is being used by all academic departments (see Appendix E). Students complete a single course evaluation instrument for each course in which they are enrolled. Near the end of each semester, students receive emails announcing the availability of the completion “window” and will be given instructions regarding access. Students are allowed to complete only one evaluation per course. The evaluation includes both quantitative survey questions, and written comments.

Online student evaluations are required for each course an instructor teaches, including minimester, summer, and off-load courses. Clinical practicum, independent study, and thesis courses are excluded from the process as are internships that do not have a didactic class component. Faculty who want an excluded course included in the online evaluation process need to notify the department chair at the beginning of the semester.

Results are available online for each faculty member after grades are posted. The Department Chair also receives the results. Reports are suppressed for all courses with fewer than three responses. The results of combined courses may be collapsed if they are taught by the same faculty member. These include combined (400/500 courses) and cross-listed courses. They will be identified as combined courses on the final reports. Faculty are required to include the entire evaluation report in their portfolio materials.

The ASLD Department considers both quantitative and qualitative feedback received from the students via the online course evaluation instrument. Evaluation of instructors will be based upon multiple factors.

1. **Quantitative Student Evaluations:**

The ASLD Department has voted to include results from some of the survey questions in their teaching evaluation process. The specific questions are listed in Appendix E. The faculty member is responsible for including an average rating across all of these items for each course in the portfolio. These ratings will be considered in an overall evaluation of teaching, as described in Appendix I.

2. **Qualitative Student Evaluations:**

All student comments from the online course evaluation system should be included in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

3. **Instructor’s Self –Analysis:**

Each faculty members will provide a well-organized, narrative self-analysis of the quantitative and qualitative feedback he/she received from the students. The faculty member will develop a plan to apply this feedback to guide and/or improve their future teaching efforts.

C. Advising Evaluations

The department is committed to providing students with a meaningful formative advising experience. Advisors are expected to meet with advisees for planning programs of study and schedule development in either individual or group sessions. Advisors are expected to mentor students into the professional discipline, to provide post-graduation advice, and to provide guidance when unique student situations arise. Advisors are also expected to maintain confidentiality. Advising will be evaluated using a form voted on and approved by the department.

1. Procedures for Completing Advising Evaluations

- a) After student advising has ended in the spring semester, the department main office sends an online advising survey to all undergraduate students in the major. Students receive emails announcing the availability of the completion “window” and will be given instructions regarding access. The evaluation includes both quantitative survey questions, and written comments.
- b) Advising survey reports are generated and sent to each advisor. The Department Chair also receives the results.
- c) Advisors must include their survey reports in their annual review portfolios.

D. Evaluation of Clinical Supervision

1. Procedures for Completing Clinical Supervision Evaluations

- a) The clinic administrators will assume responsibility for insuring that all students enrolled in clinical practicum complete the on-line supervisor evaluation. Students who have more than one supervisor will evaluate each one separately.
- b) The chairperson, clinic directors, and ASLD office staff will organize and disseminate individual supervisor evaluations.
- c) If a clinical supervisor has very few students, there may be an issue with confidentiality relative to the supervisor evaluation process. If applicable, the P&T and RM committees will consider this issue as part of the deliberation process.

E. Evaluation of Administrative Abilities

Faculty who are assigned significant administrative duties as part of their workload, or are paid off-load for significant administrative duties, may be required to have peers and if appropriate, students, evaluate their administrative abilities. Evaluation forms will be developed and approved by the department. Faculty assigned significant administrative loads for other reasons will be included in this evaluation process.

The Dean's office is responsible for coordinating the Department Chair's Evaluation. The ASLD office is responsible for coordinating the evaluation of Program and Clinic Directors. When evaluations are completed, the ASLD office distributes this survey electronically at the end of the spring semester. The chairperson will review the results and distribute them to the respective faculty member. Administrative faculty are expected to include the forms in their annual portfolios.

VII. Approval of the Promotion and Tenure Document

Every three years (at a minimum), all tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty will review and vote to approve the Department of Audiology, Speech Language Pathology and Deaf Studies Promotion and Tenure Expectations and Policies document. The vote will be completed using a written or electronic ballot. Faculty who do not vote will be recorded as abstaining. Any revisions must be submitted to the dean of the college, by the second Friday in October.

Appendix A
Promotion and Tenure Calendar

| Task | University/Dept. Policy Deadline |
|---|--|
| Workload Agreements due to Chair | 1 st Friday in June |
| Portfolio Documents due to Chair | 1 st Friday in June |
| Workload Agreement due to Dean | 2 nd Friday in June |
| Deadline to update Portfolios (Binders) and Workload Agreements | August 19 th |
| P&T Committee Deliberations Begin (followed by Reappointment & Merit Deliberations) | To begin after August 20 with deadline by last Friday in September |
| Peer Teaching Evaluation Schedule Distributed | September 15 th |
| SENTF signed by new faculty | 3 rd Friday in September |
| Submission of Request for Promotion or Tenure Review | 3 rd Friday in September |
| Reports for reappointment, tenure, promotion, annual review, merit signed by faculty. | 2 nd Friday in October |
| ASLD PTRM docs delivered to CHP if any changes are made | 2 nd Friday in October |
| PTRM materials and reports forwarded to the Dean | 2 nd Friday in November |
| Faculty course evaluations | End of Fall Semester |
| Portfolio documents/binders due from new and 3 rd -year faculty | 2 nd Friday in December |
| ASLD P&T Committee Meeting (New faculty Mid-Year & 3 rd Year review) | Third Friday in January |
| Reports for new faculty signed by faculty member | 3 rd Friday in January |
| Provost Letter Sent to New Faculty | March 1 st |
| Provost Letter Sent to All Other Faculty | 3 rd Friday in March |
| Faculty appeal to Provost Decisions | 21 calendar days after decision letter issued |
| Faculty Advising Evaluations | 1 st Friday in May |
| Administrative Evaluations | 1 st Friday in May |

Appendix B
Student Quantitative Evaluations of Courses

The following questions from the Towson University on-line student assessment form will be used:

1. Assignments/tests reflected primary content of course as set out in the course learning objectives
2. Course was clearly organized
3. Course learning objectives were met
4. I understand the requirements for course grading
5. Instructor explained concepts clearly
6. Instructor assigned grades according to stated criteria
7. Instructor provided feedback on my performance as the course progressed
8. Instructor demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter
9. Instructor was available for consultation

In addition the following questions will be added:

1. Instructor taught to the level of class comprehension
2. Instructor was concerned about student learning
3. Individual class periods (lectures, discussions, and activities) were well planned to optimize student learning
4. Instructor encouraged critical thinking
5. Classes began and ended on time
6. Instructor created a positive learning environment

Total of 15 questions

The Department Chair will determine the average for these 15 questions for each course. The average is used to determine whether the course is “Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory”. The standards for determining this status are listed in Appendix I of the ASLD Promotion and Tenure Expectations and Policies Document.

Appendix C
Scholarship Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

| Scholar-Teacher | Teacher-Scholar | Dedicated Teacher | Clinical Faculty |
|--|--|--|---|
| Developing new research initiatives for current and future scholarly endeavors that move beyond the dissertation or move beyond research completed prior to hiring at Towson University. | Developing new research initiatives for current and future scholarly endeavors that move beyond the dissertation or move beyond research completed prior to hiring at Towson University. | Developing new research initiatives for current and future scholarly endeavors that move beyond the dissertation or move beyond research completed prior to hiring at Towson University. | Integration of current knowledge into teaching and/or clinical supervision experiences. |
| Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline or related discipline. | Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline or related discipline. | Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline or related discipline. | Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline or related discipline. |
| A sustained record of scholarly presentations at regional, national or international conferences. | A sustained record of scholarly presentations at state, regional, national or international conferences. | A record of scholarly presentations at university, local, state, regional, national or international conferences. | A minimum of 3 presentations at university, local, state, regional, national or international conferences. OR accomplish 1 item on the list A or B below. |
| Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in peer reviewed journal related to the discipline. | Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed journal related to the discipline. | Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed journal related to the discipline. | |
| In Addition, For ALL promotion and/or tenure decisions: Accomplish 2 items from List A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OR, 1 item from List A and 1 item from List B. | In Addition, For promotion to Associate/Tenure: Accomplish 1 item from List A. For Promotion to Full: accomplish 1 item from List A or B. | In Addition, For promotion to Associate/Tenure: Accomplish 1 item from List A. For Promotion to Full: accomplish 1 item from List A or B. | In Addition, For promotion to Clinical Associate: no additional requirements. For promotion to Clinical Professor: A sustained record of scholarship to include at least one peer-reviewed publication and other scholarly work that is validated and disseminated to the professional community; |
| <p>List A</p> <p>1) Publication of one article in a peer reviewed journal related to the discipline. (Can be counted more than once).</p> <p>2) Authoring a book that undergoes peer-review (Can only be counted once).</p> <p>3) Publication of a non-peer reviewed article, book chapter or substantial manuscript in a professional publication to the editor, brief notes, 1-page articles, short newsletter pieces, or columns do not count) (Can only be counted once).</p> <p>4) Funding awarded as Principle or Co-Investigator for external research grants or contracts equaling \$50,000 or (Can be counted more than once).</p> | | | |

List B

- 1) Funding awarded as Principle or Co-Investigator for external research grants or contracts equaling \$5,000 to \$49,999.
- 2) Funding awarded for Towson University Faculty Development Research Grant or other internal grant (only counts for Associate/Tenure recommendation).

Appendix D
Scholarly Activities for Merit Evaluation

| Substantial Scholarly Activities = 3 points | Intermediate Scholarly Activities = 2 points | Additional Scholarly Activities = 1 point |
|---|---|--|
| <p><u>Initial</u> submission or <u>Publication</u> of one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research article to a peer reviewed journal • Book chapter <p>Significant manuscript to a professional publication</p> | <p>Submission of an external grant or contract greater than \$4,999.01 but less than \$49,999.99</p> | <p>Submission of an external grant or contract less than \$5,000.00</p> |
| <p><u>Resubmission</u> after substantial revision of a research article to a peer reviewed journal, or resubmission of a significant manuscript to a professional publication. Resubmissions for a particular piece can only be counted one time. If the piece is submitted a 2nd or 3rd time, even to a different publication, the resubmissions cannot be counted</p> | <p>Chair of a graduate student theses or Master's research paper (can only be counted the semester the student finishes the project)</p> | <p>Publication of scholarly items in professional publications such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletter pieces • Letter to the Editor • Brief 1-2 page articles • Columns |
| <p>Significant presentations at regional, national, or international conferences or invited presentation at a local/state conference outside the region, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keynote talks • Seminars (1 hour or longer) • Workshops | <p>Presentation at a national or international conference.</p> | <p>Presentation at a regional, state, local or university conference</p> |
| <p>Submission of an external grant or contract greater than \$50,000</p> | <p>Serve as a peer reviewer for a research article in a professional journal or research grant</p> | <p>Supervise a research-related student independent study</p> |
| <p>Awarded an external grant > \$5,000</p> | <p>Awarded a Towson University Faculty Development Research Grant or other internal grant</p> | <p>Facilitate a student research presentation at a professional conference</p> |
| <p>Invited participation on research panels such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NIH or similar national or international research panels • ASHA task force, ad-hoc committees or similar groups | <p>Creation of clinical programs/services for the public that occur multiple days within one semester and generate revenue or academic research</p> | <p>Serve as a peer reviewer for a book in the discipline</p> |
| <p>Creation of new or significantly revised or</p> | | <p>Creation of clinical programs/services for the</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>expanded clinical program or services for the public that span multiple semesters (more substantive than one day screenings or events), involve student learning and generate clinical revenue or academic related research</p> | | <p>public that occurs on one day (or equivalent of one day) and generates revenue or academic related research.</p> |
| <p>Recipient of an external award recognizing scholarly contributions to the profession</p> | | |

Appendix E Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching is multi-dimensional, and it involves creating and changing individual courses, making larger-scale curriculum changes in a program, mentoring students and faculty, and academic advising. The primary focus for the evaluation of teaching for faculty is on a course-by-course basis; however, other aspects of teaching and advising, and the evolution of teachers, should also be examined.

Teaching effectiveness in the classroom has multiple dimensions and its evaluation should, similarly, include an examination of multiple dimensions through various sources of information. Instructors are expected to seek out constructive feedback from students and other faculty members, form their own scholarly observations of teaching, reflect on feedback from multiple sources, evolve over time in pedagogy, and, when needed, develop and implement an effective plan for change that addresses any problems identified during the evaluation process. Student quantitative and qualitative evaluations are important and problems that extend across classes or semesters could be considered indicators of poor teaching. However, low response rates sometimes affect the validity of student evaluations on a single-course basis, so they should be considered important, but not the sole indicator of teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations can also offer important information. Again, these are important aspects of teaching evaluation, but they examine only one class, and are, thus, only part of the evaluation process of teaching effectiveness. Creating a teaching narrative is another way teaching effectiveness can be examined, allowing an instructor to identify strong and weak areas based upon multiple sources of data and to provide a plan for how the pedagogy should develop over time and changes that need to be implemented for specific courses.

Multiple aspects of teaching will be evaluated by the TP and RM committees, resulting in the overall evaluation of teaching as unsatisfactory, effective, or excellent. The items used to evaluate professors are listed below. Professors may have qualities that fall within one, two, or even all three of these categories. The TP and RM committees will use quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources as the basis for discussion and recommendation for re-appointment and merit decisions. For multi-year reviews, the committees will consider teaching across the entire period of review. Recommendation letters will indicate the evidence used to support the final decision of the committee for each faculty member. In difficult cases, this portion of the letter is expected to be more extensive than for faculty who clearly fall within one category.

Unsatisfactory Teaching can be identified by any of the following:

1. Teaching narrative did not describe how the professor used multiple forms of feedback to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness.
2. Professor failed to acknowledge negative trends in the teaching narrative and/or to plan appropriately to address these trends.
3. Problems identified in previous years were not adequately or effectively addressed.
4. Persistent lateness to class, absence from class, and/or cancellation of classes.
5. Dismissing students early from class on a consistent basis.

6. No evidence of changes in teaching over time to address changes in the field of study or to address changes in pedagogy appropriate for the course.
7. Evidence of not returning assignments or exams in a timely manner across more than one course during the period of review.
8. Peer evaluations were consistently below 4.0/5.0
9. Failure to acknowledge and address areas of concern identified by peer evaluations
10. Multiple student complaints to the program coordinator/director or department chairperson regarding the course/professor that are not acknowledged in the narrative and/or adequately addressed by the professor.
11. Failure to observe clinical students in practicum as required by department guidelines.
12. Consistently poor advising evaluations (< 3.5/5.0), if available.
13. Areas of concern from advising evaluations are not acknowledge and addressed by the faculty member and/or no positive changes are seen over time.
14. Consistently poor teaching evaluations (<3.5/5.0) across more than one course during the period of review (first-year faculty and/or faculty teaching a new course preparation may be exempt from this criterion). (Note: If low response rates to student evaluations appear to have affected the validity of the assessment, the faculty member should address this in the narrative and it will be discussed by the P&T committee.)
15. Failure to complete assigned peer teaching observation(s) for the required semester(s) as noted in the ASLD Faculty Visitation Schedule

Effective/Satisfactory Teaching is demonstrated by a majority of the following:

1. Teaching narrative described how the professor used multiple forms of feedback to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness.
2. Professor acknowledged negative trends in the teaching narrative and has described a plan to appropriately to address these trends.
3. Participating appropriately in the peer evaluation process.
 - a) Responding promptly to peer evaluator request to schedule observations.
 - b) Completing peer evaluations as assigned.
4. Demonstrating competence in delivering current knowledge of course topic or clinical content.
 - a) Updating course content, references, or pedagogy based on current and emerging trends, for at least one course during the period of review
 - b) Updating course content or pedagogy based upon feedback from students, peers, self-analysis, changes in the profession, and changes in accreditation or certification standards.
 - c) Developing syllabi, handouts, exams, and assignments appropriate for the course and, where appropriate, including information in the syllabus relevant to accreditation standards.
 - d) Providing effective clinical supervision.
 - e) Teaching students to provide clinical services that are supported by current evidence based practice
5. Effective teaching or clinical supervision through lectures, discussions, collaborative activities, and, where applicable, hands-on activities.
6. Appropriate planning and structure of courses or clinical experiences.

7. Demonstrating appropriate responsiveness to individual students
 - a) Demonstrating responsiveness to cultural and individual differences in student learners.
 - b) Managing student issues appropriately and confidentially, if applicable.
 - c) Responding to chairperson reports of student complaints, if applicable.
 - d) Meeting individually with students, as needed.
8. Focusing on incorporating appropriate instructional technology into teaching and clinical supervision.
 - a) Participating in continuing education or professional development in pedagogy and/or course content areas.
 - b) Documenting changes in instructional technologies and teaching techniques in AR, for at least one course during the period under review.
9. Effective assessment of student learning with appropriate rigor for the course level.
10. Returning assignments and exams to students in a timely manner.
11. If applicable, submitting required assessment data to the program director/coordinator or chairperson for Towson University assessment or external accreditation.
12. If advising, demonstrating effective advising.
 - a) Demonstrating knowledge of the curriculum
 - b) Meeting with students in a timely manner
 - c) Managing student records (i.e., documenting meetings; maintaining confidentiality).
 - d) Managing student conflict, as needed, and seeking advice, if necessary.
 - e) Receiving satisfactory advising evaluations.
 - f) Negative trends appropriately acknowledged and address in the teaching narrative.
13. Teaching or supervising effectively, through lectures, discussions, hands-on training, written feedback to students, and student classroom experiences as demonstrated by:
 - a) Average peer evaluations of 4.0/5.0 or higher over the period of review. All negative trends appropriately acknowledged and addressed.
 - b) Student qualitative comments on course evaluations that are generally positive with negative trends appropriately identified and discussed relative to their validity and impact on future courses. Plans for changes to address problem areas should be described and implemented.
 - c) Providing teaching narrative that discusses student feedback, peer feedback, self-reflection, and data analysis to make changes in teaching pedagogy, supervisor practices, course design, or clinical administration.
 - d) Individual items on the student ratings are examined and discussed, if negative trends emerge. For multi-year reviews, evolution of teaching over time with problem issues (if present) effectively addressed over time.

Excellence in Teaching Effectiveness is demonstrated by two or more of the following:

1. Significant improvement in teaching from previous year
2. Receiving a teaching or advising award.
3. Excellence in the analysis of multiple forms of feedback in the teaching narrative along with evidence that planned changes were effective in improving teaching.

4. Taking academic risks by trying cutting edge teaching techniques or technologies that may result in the department better meeting the needs of current and future students.
5. Playing a key role in program creation or curriculum changes that have a substantive positive impact on current students and/or the potential for substantive positive impact on future students.
6. Consistently excellent (≥ 4.25) student and peer quantitative and qualitative evaluations across time. Note: in order to qualify, faculty must include overall student quantitative data from the previous three (3) academic years in the binder.
7. Effectively mentoring other faculty in the area of teaching, advising, clinical supervision, or thesis supervision, among others.
8. For faculty under review for promotion, documentation of significant growth in teaching effectiveness over the period under review (e.g., steep growth curve on student evaluations, substantive and clearly documented changes to syllabi as a result of feedback) that results in effective changes to pedagogy as the result of the use of multiple forms of feedback and careful planning will be considered evidence of excellence in teaching.

Appendix F
External Requirements for Limitations on Merit Awards

Modifications to department promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit procedures requires thoughtful reflection, lively debate in which a diversity of opinions is shared, dissemination of proposed changes, and a majority vote. Substantive changes often require a substantial time period. Consistency in expectations is important for junior faculty members to ensure the pathway is clearly articulated for re-appointment, tenure, promotion, and merit. For this reason, and to ensure an orderly manner in which changes are made, the department will follow the regular three year PTRM review cycles when making changes. However, this time-line restricts the ability of the department to nimbly meet policy changes dictated from higher levels. Further, when policy changes are disseminated by the provost, it is often unclear if and when the changes will be enforced. For this reason, the department provides, below, the procedure in which it will respond to a proposed change in merit procedures issued by the Towson University provost in AY 2013-2014.

Each faculty member in the Department of Audiology, Speech-Language Pathology and Deaf Studies is evaluated for merit based upon his/her performance relative to workload and department expectations. Merit is assigned based upon one of the three categories: (a) no merit (unsatisfactory), (b) base merit (satisfactory/meets workload expectations), and (c) base plus merit (excellent/exceeds expectations). Limitations on the percentage of faculty in the department who are eligible to receive base plus merit were recommended by the university provost in 2013-2014 but were not required by established P&T policy. The recommendations were as follows: no more than 60% of faculty will receive base plus merit for work evaluated in AY 2015-16, no more than 50% in AY 2016-17, no more than 40% in AY 2017-18, and no more than 30% from AY 2018-19 onwards (e.g., total number of eligible faculty x % specified by the university = number of possible base + merit awards).. If such policies are enforced by the provost and/or merit policies put in place by the College of Health Professions or University Promotion and Tenure Committees, Towson University Senate, or other governing body with the right to establish such policies, the Department of Audiology, Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology will abide by these policies. In this event, all faculty who are assigned the classification of base plus merit will constitute the pool of potential recipients. The Reappointment and Merit Committee Chairperson will determine the total number of base plus merit awards that can be made during a review period, based upon the total number of eligible faculty. This is to include all faculty reviewed for merit who are tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty. If lecturers are determined by the university to be part of the merit pool, then these faculty will also be included.

If the number of available base plus merit awards based upon the percentage calculation is less than the number of faculty rated as base plus merit by individual review, then the merit committee will reduce the number of faculty in that rating category until it is at or below the maximum number. The remaining faculty will be re-assigned to the base merit category. The decision will be made following group discussion and vote. Consideration will be made for the following factors: (1) scholarship that far exceeds expectations relative to workload, (2) excellence in teaching, (3) willingness to take on service projects that meet a critical need for the department, (4) leadership that is appropriately balanced with scholarly output. The voting shall proceed as follows: (a) a quorum must be present and at least one clinical

faculty and one tenured/tenure track faculty member must be present for the discussion and vote, (b) members of the merit committee may not vote for themselves, (c) RM committee members will rank all eligible candidates, (d) RM committee members will submit their ranked list as a secret ballot containing their employee ID number. The RM chairperson will determine the average rank for each faculty member. The top candidates will be selected for base plus merit. In the case of tied rankings that result in more than the allowed number of faculty to be awarded base+ merit, the RM committee will rank, separately, just the names involved in the tie. If the merit committee is unable or unwilling to select a list of names that is equal to or less than the maximum number of base plus merit awards, the chairperson of the department will write a separate recommendation letter to the dean with the list of names of faculty members who should receive base plus merit from the list of faculty with individual base plus merit ratings.