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I. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE FACULTY -- AN OVERVIEW

A. Department of Health Science Position Statement on Promotion, Reappointment, Tenure and Merit

The members of the Department of Health Science believe that faculty evaluation is important for a variety of reasons. First, it is a requirement of the University, which mandates participation by all faculty seeking Promotion and/or Tenure. Second, faculty evaluation is a process contributing to colleagues’ ability to gauge their professional performance. Third, constructive faculty evaluation can provide one way to examine the faculty member’s contributions and/or performance annually and over time to meet the needs of the students and/or Department. Underlying the Promotion and Tenure process in general, and faculty evaluation in particular, is recognition of the need to allow for philosophical diversity within the Department.

All areas outlined in the current Towson University policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty, herein referred to in this document as “ART Policy, Appendix 3” are to be addressed during the faculty evaluation process. Those areas include (1) teaching, which entails peer, student evaluation and self-evaluation; (2) scholarship; and (3) service to the institution, department, discipline, and community.

1 Professional performance shall be evaluated using those standards outlined in the current University ART document (August 2013), the College of Health Professions PTRM policies as well as those criteria and standards established and approved by Department of Health Science faculty.

2 “Current” refers to the policies that have been approved by the University for use in the respective evaluative year.
B. General Principles and Expectations for All Department of Health Science Faculty (Tenured, Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty)

1. Faculty members will abide by the following documents:

   a. The current ART Policy, Appendix 3 which contains sections that address rank; faculty rights and responsibilities; faculty workload, contractual policies; policies for promotion, merit, and tenure review for tenure-track faculty; comprehensive review and sections that address reappointment for non-tenure-track faculty;

   b. The policies and procedures of the College of Health Professions; and

   c. The policies and procedures set forth in the Department of Health Science Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit document.

2. Faculty members in the Department of Health Science are expected, at a minimum, to meet the following expectations for merit, promotion, tenure and comprehensive review:

   a. Committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. This refers to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision-making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters related to curriculum, academic personnel and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, civil and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. That is, faculty is expected to contribute to the academic life of the department by supporting the activities of colleagues, actively participating in service to the department, college and/or university, contributing to curriculum and student-related activities. Civility with colleagues, students and staff is an expectation.
b. **Is a responsible educator.** A faculty member is expected, at minimum, to meet classes as scheduled and establish office hours so as to be available to students for consultation.

c. **Meets responsibilities associated with student advising.** Faculty are expected to assume advising responsibilities to assist students as they plan their course of study, assess their progress to degree and take responsibility for their academic and professional growth. This activity will be done with accuracy and will be professional in nature. Faculty will establish available time for advising purposes.

d. **Committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty, professional development and scholarly growth.**

e. **Shares responsibility for University governance and is an active participant in the faculty evaluation process, as described herein.**

**C. Overview of General Procedures for Faculty Evaluation**

1. Each faculty member, tenured, tenure-track and clinical, shall be evaluated annually according to the procedures and criteria described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3. All faculty shall complete the current version of the Annual Report (AR) Part I and Part II and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3. The Department Chair shall review the “Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations” (Part II of the Annual Report (AR) Form) submitted by each faculty member. Upon review, the Department Chair will forward to the Dean for review and approval.

2. All first-year faculty, in collaboration with the Department Chair, shall complete the form, “Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty,” (SENTF) and include it in their evaluation portfolio as described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3. The Department Chair shall append to the SENTF form the following materials:
a. Board of Regents’ and Towson University’s criteria for annual reports, contract renewal, tenure, promotion, merit and comprehensive review considerations;
b. standards and expectations of the university, college and department;
c. any expectations unique to the position.

3. The faculty member’s complete portfolio shall be forwarded at each level of the evaluation process for annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and comprehensive review by the respective evaluator(s). The Dean of the College or designee shall follow procedures regarding the summative portfolio when forwarding material to the Provost. Chairs of evaluating committees shall have the responsibility to comply with the “Towson University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit” calendar and forward material appropriately.

4. For all recommendations of reappointment, merit, promotion, tenure and comprehensive review, a faculty member’s performance will be based upon documentation provided via the Faculty Annual Report, Workload Agreement, peer classroom observations, student evaluations and self-evaluative narratives. (See current ART Policy, Appendix 3).

a. The Department Promotion and Tenure, and Reappointment and Merit Committees assesses the quality of all activities, teaching and advising, scholarship, and service, in an independent evaluation process (current ART Policy, Appendix 3);

b. Faculty reviews shall be in accordance with the process established via the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and those further stipulated by the College and Department. The respective guidelines shall be used to evaluate the portfolio of
each faculty member and rate the faculty member according to the following scale:

1 = Not Meritorious  
2 = Satisfactory  
3 = Excellent

5. All evaluation recommendations will be based upon teaching, scholarship and service performance, in accordance with workload agreements for the period under review. (For standards and expectations of faculty at various ranks, refer to College of Health Professions, PTRM Policies and Procedures, “CHP Standards & Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship and Service.”) In evaluating faculty performance, the following will be considered:

a. **teaching and advising**, includes comments on the faculty member’s strengths and areas encouraged for development. At minimum, tenure-track/tenured faculty shall demonstrate:

- knowledge of the emerging needs in one’s field/discipline;
- refinement, updates & improvements in courses one teaches using student and peer evaluations to guide/inform changes;
- a commitment to participation in effective student advising;
- effective & successful participation in course and/or program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice and/or sustained experience in one’s field/discipline.
- Teaching may also include development of materials for new course preparation and instruction; development of innovative teaching strategies for course instruction, curriculum projects and/or software/hardware.
- “Excellence” in teaching requires recognition among Department members and evidence to support this rating. Excellence in teaching may be evident as reflected in teaching documents (i.e.,

---

3 Herein, the College of Health Professions “Standards & Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship & Service” will be referred to as “CHP Criteria for Evaluation.”
syllabi, examples of course assignments, rubrics, etc.), overall goals and evaluations submitted via the faculty’s portfolio.

Evidence must demonstrate a consistent command of course content, proficiency in classroom techniques and strategies to assist student academic achievement. Other types of evidence would include but not be limited to: teaching awards, supervision of student research projects that earn distinction outside the department, new course development requiring continuing education and serving the needs of the department, taking on a leadership role in the development, implementation and/or assessment of project/program to enhance student learning, advising/mentoring.

(i) Information will be gathered via:

- Course syllabi,
- Advising load
- peer evaluations,
- student evaluations,
- self-evaluation (e.g., correlation statements, teaching narratives, etc.)
- evaluation of student learning outcomes (e.g. GPA distributions) and
- judgments related to faculty performance by peers fulfilling responsibilities as members of evaluating bodies

(iii) Self-evaluation of teaching and/or advising effectiveness shall include an insightful, reflective narrative. The narrative shall include a summative analysis of student and peer evaluations, as applicable, to identify important trends in the information, how these trends interface with the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and course objectives, and a plan of action, if any, over the next academic year. Faculty is encouraged to communicate anomalies and plan of action.
(iii) In the event a faculty member’s performance has been rated consistently below expectations, the Department Chair shall develop a remediation plan in consultation with the faculty member. This plan might include mentoring, additional classroom visitations, and/or counseling for improvement of teaching effectiveness. A plan shall be in place regardless of the rank and/or tenure status of the faculty.

b. scholarly activity and professional growth at minimum, shall be appropriate to the individual’s rank and professional/academic goals. Tenure-track/tenured faculty shall demonstrate the ability to initiate, implement and complete scholarly work at Towson University in his/her research or area of specialty as evidenced by scholarly activities, unpublished scholarly outcomes, and/or publications. These activities shall include but not be limited to:

- application of one’s professional expertise to the community;
- presentations at international, national, regional, or local conferences relating to the discipline/profession conferences;
- development of innovative teaching strategies for instruction that have been reviewed and assessed by peers and disseminated to the disciplines/profession;
- development of new programs, writing of grant proposals;
- scholarly contributions applied to the field through school and/or community health and service organizations;
- book reviews, manuscript reviews, writing books or chapters in books;
- reports to sponsors and/or publications in professional journals.

c. service to the institution (Department, College, University, and UM System governance system), discipline and/or the community. Tenure-track/tenured faculty shall demonstrate a record of sustained involvement in shared governance that includes activities beyond simply being a member of the group. In addition to committee participation at department, college and university levels, service activities may include but are not limited to:
• leadership roles in major committees at all levels including professional organizations;
• preparation of books and/or manuals used by the Department, College, University, or System.

In reporting service contributions, faculty are expected to
• list service activities;
• note, in detail, what the service contribution entailed and,
• comment on service activity significance.

7. Form of Documentation and Materials to be Included for Performance Evaluation

a. The faculty member under review is responsible for compiling and submitting material for the annual review, merit, reappointment, promotion, tenure and/or comprehensive review. Documents are due by 3rd Friday in June.

b. All material and documentation used in making recommendations for reappointment, tenure, promotion, merit and comprehensive review shall contain adequate and comparable information, submitted in the form of a portfolio addressing expectations for faculty at the respective rank, as outlined by the University, college and department.

c. Portfolios shall be organized, indexed and placed in a 3-ring binder. Contents of the portfolio are determined by the type of review (i.e., annual/merit, promotion/tenure, comprehensive review).

(i) Annual review of all faculty

Annual review materials must include the following documents:
• AR (Annual Report) or CAR (Chair’s Annual Report) Form
• Current Curriculum vitae
• Syllabi of courses taught during year under review
• Evaluation, of teaching and advising as appropriate, that includes the following:
  o Qualitative evaluation of own teaching performance

- Student evaluations reports for each course taught during the period of review;
- Distributions of number of grades for each undergraduate and/or graduate course taught during the period of review;
- Relevant documentation supporting scholarship and service contributions

(ii) Annual review of non-tenured faculty (tenure-track, clinical faculty)

Tenure-track and clinical faculty shall add the following items to the list above in 5c(i):
- Peer evaluations
- Departmental recommendation letter, which must include a written report on the candidate’s performance that includes
  - for tenure-track faculty, a statement of progress toward tenure;
  - for clinical faculty, recommendation for reappointment.

(iii) Full review of candidates for promotion and/or tenure

A critical part of the portfolio shall be a narrative statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, scholarship, and service expectations as a member of Towson University’s faculty. All materials listed above in 5c(i) and 5c(ii) from the candidate’s date of hire or last promotion must also be included.

(iv) Comprehensive five year review of tenured faculty

Once every five years, based on the established schedule for review, the annual review shall include a comprehensive five-year review. Faculty evaluation will include teaching, through student evaluations and peer review; assessment of scholarship, primarily through peer review and consistent with the University, College and Department standards and mission; and service as defined in this handbook. Materials used for the comprehensive review may include information on publications (including non-print media), grants, international exchanges, technological innovations, works in progress, descriptions of special projects, letters of recommendations, teaching observation reports, and other information
from the faculty workload document. A reflective comprehensive summary shall be written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five years of his or her work. Faculty must follow specific instructions from the Office of the Provost concerning the organization and presentation of materials. For additional details, see Comprehensive Review Policies and Procedures as described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3.

(v)  **Merit review**

Merit review shall be concurrent with annual review. The review shall follow policies, standards, and procedures outlined in the department’s merit policy as approved by the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment. The merit appeal process shall follow the same protocol as the promotion and tenure process. (Refer to the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and pages 32-33 in this document for procedures related to appeal.)

d.  Faculty for promotion, tenure and comprehensive review shall prepare two portfolios, a summative portfolio, in addition to the lengthier supportive portfolio that lends specificity to the faculty member’s credentials. The summative portfolio shall be transmitted from the Dean of the College to the Provost. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member’s name, department and area of review (teaching, scholarship, service). In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled within a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed. As stipulated in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3, the summative portfolio will contain the following required documents and shall be presented in the following order:

**Section I   University Forms**

- Faculty Annual Report (AR, Part I)
- Summary of Student Evaluation
• Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations (AR, Part II)

• A copy of one recent publication or description of creative activity

Section II Current Curriculum Vitae

Section III

Annual summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments. The order of the materials in each section should be from most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

Section IV

The written recommendation of the department PT and RM committees, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) form, the written recommendation of the academic chair, and written recommendation of the college.

[Note: For Section IV, the College PTRM chair and the dean have responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations are included in the folder.] The department shall retain any other supportive materials and make them available if needed. These materials are not to be forwarded unless specifically requested.

e. If materials cannot be submitted in keeping with the established “Towson University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit” calendar, it is the individual faculty member’s responsibility to communicate with the Department PTRM Committees chair and the department chair to alert them to this delay. Any delays in submission should be the result of extenuating circumstances. The Department PT and RM Committees chair will consult with the Department Chair to establish a new due date and inform the faculty person in writing of the deadline. The deadline established will not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, Comprehensive Review Calendar.
II. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE FACULTY

A. Teaching and Advising

1. Teaching takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology or classroom-based research to improve teaching, the development of new courses and programs, especially those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement curriculum foci, faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate thesis preparation, emphasis on pedagogy including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum and other aspects of learning and its assessment and includes advising responsibilities.

2. Teaching effectiveness shall be based on student evaluations, peer observations (as appropriate), and the judgment related to faculty performance made by evaluating bodies. Criteria for evaluating teaching shall be based on the following considerations:

   a. striving for excellence and competence as a teacher in courses at all levels of
      the curriculum, as appropriate to the faculty member’s areas of expertise and
      interests and the department’s curricular needs;
   b. exhibiting on-going growth as a classroom teacher at all stages of the career,
      developing new methods, pedagogies, and competencies and engages in
      honest self-evaluation;
   c. demonstrating competency as reflected in peer and student evaluations
   d. developing new courses and curricular initiatives;
   e. fulfilling role as adviser to both undergraduate and graduate students.
   f. constructively addressing any areas of concern which may be expressed
      in student and peer evaluations, merit deliberations, etc;
   g. meeting all classes as scheduled and informing the department chair of
      circumstances requiring absences;
   h. preparing syllabi for each course in accordance with university and
      department standards and to file a copy of each syllabus with the department.
3. The primary purpose of the faculty academic advisor is to assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans.

4. Other forms of advising may include guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on a graduate research committee.

B. Department of Health Science Statement on Scholarship Activities

1. The Department of Health Science adheres to the scholarship standards described in the Towson University ART Policy, Appendix 3 and CHP Evaluation Criteria and recognizes their importance in making promotion and tenure determinations. The Department recognizes that scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many diverse forms in the domains of application, discovery, integration, and teaching. Based on these domains, the Department also has developed its own unique statement on scholarship that reflects the nature of the work engaged in by professionals working in the field of Health Science. All faculty in the department are expected to have a focused scholarship agenda with clearly delineated goals. The statement below reflects the consensus of the Department’s faculty and provides a framework for the review of faculty work on an annual basis and promotion, tenure and merit decisions.

2. As defined by faculty of the Department of Health Science, scholarship encompasses three types of activities: (a) the generation of new knowledge for the field through research, (b) the synthesis of existing knowledge and information and its transmission to the academic discipline, professional practice and the public, and/or (c) the development, assessment and transmission of new methodologies for teaching and training in the various fields of study Department of Health Science faculty are engaged.
a. The generation of new knowledge for the discipline/field through the conduct of research is illustrated by the following products and activities:

- Publications in refereed journals serving the discipline;
- Books, edited or authored, that convey the findings of the research;
- Presentations (refereed or invited) at professional, discipline-specific conferences and events;
- Funding of the work by outside funders (government, foundations, businesses, etc.);
- Funded and unfunded research that leads to publications, presentations or other scholarly endorsement of the work and its contribution to the field.

b. The synthesis of existing knowledge and information and its transmission to the academic discipline, professional practice and the public is illustrated by the following products and activities:

- Publications in refereed journals serving the discipline or professional practice;
- Presentations (refereed or invited) at professional or practice meetings;
- Training manuals or reports that are disseminated in the practice arena;
- “White papers”, reports or other documents prepared under professional organizational auspices and disseminated throughout the profession/field;
- Web seminars, new courses approved by the University, training seminars or other events that are sanctioned by a professional organization or provided on a continuing education credit basis;
- Articles, reports, media, films or videos that are designed for public dissemination and that enhance the availability of information about health and related topics.
c. The development, assessment and transmission of new methodologies for teaching and training in the fields in which faculty are engaged, illustrated by the following:

- The dissemination of a new approach/curriculum through professional continuing education events, discipline-specific workshops;
- Training material (including print, media or web-based material) that is distributed through professional networks;
- Refereed articles in journals;
- Articles in professional trade magazines;
- “Train the trainers” events and material.

4. Section IIB2(c) refers to teaching methodologies and innovative technologies that have application within the academic and practice community. Objective review and assessment by peers and transmission within the academic community and/or the discipline is required for this form of scholarship.

5. Comparative Statement: The three scholarship types described are considered to be equal in status by the Health Science faculty. The scholarship of inquiry, the scholarship of synthesis and the scholarship of teaching and training are all important areas to the disciplines and the work in which Health Science faculty are involved and represented.

C. College Of Health Professions Definition of Scholarship

The College of Health Professions defines scholarship as activities that require intellectual rigor, that contribute to the academic/professional knowledge base and/or that reflect application of that knowledge base, and that are disseminated and validated. Faculty is expected to integrate their scholarship with the educational

---

4 For examples at various ranks, see “College of Health Professions Examples of Teaching, Scholarship & Service,” Appendix A in CHP PTRM Policies & Procedures.”
mission of their department, the College and the University. Scholarship activities may include the following items. Evaluation of the intellectual rigor, degree of contribution to the professional field, dissemination, and validation of these items is conducted during the promotion and tenure process.

1. Grants: submitted, funded, and/or implemented on topics within or related to the discipline.

2. Professional publications: refereed or non-refereed, within or related to the discipline.

3. Podium presentations, within or related to the discipline.

4. Poster presentations related to special fields of knowledge within or related to the discipline.

5. Research activities including clinical, applied, and/or basic within or related to the discipline.

6. Professional reviews of scholarly works including books, manuscripts, journal articles, and grants within or related to the discipline.

7. Editorship of professional publications within or related to the discipline.

8. Professional reviewer of academic programs such as external accreditation reviews, external program reviews, and consultant review of accredited programs within or related to the discipline.

9. Other professional roles that require specialized expertise in the discipline such as chairing or serving on a professional board that produces a scholarly product (report, curriculum, etc.).
10. Enhancing professional expertise within or related to the discipline.

D. Service to the Institution, Discipline & Community

1. This area includes service to the institution (Department, College, University and/or UM System), which includes but is not limited to:

   - departmental committees (e.g., Curriculum Committee; Promotion and Tenure Reappointment, and Merit Committees; Search Committees)
   - representing the Department on the College Council;
   - serving on standing committees of the College Council;
   - serving on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee;
   - serving on the University Senate, and/or any standing committees or ad hoc committees to the Senate which enhance the governance of the institution;
   - serving on committees to enhance the University’s programs that enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity.

2. Community-Related Activities/Services – Citizenship

   The phrase “community related activities” here means any activity in which a faculty member brings to the community professional expertise regardless of payment of fee or salary, not simply performing one’s responsibilities as a good citizen or community member. Faculty members will not be permitted to substitute this activity for lessened performance as a teacher and scholar. (See current ART Policy, Appendix 3.) Service to business or industry, and service to public or private organizations would be included as community-related activities and services.
III. GENERAL STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE FACULTY

A. Merit

1. Criteria: The Department follows the criteria outlined in this document, the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and CHP “Criteria for Evaluation”.

2. Procedures:

   a. Evaluation of faculty for merit shall occur on an annual basis. The annual performance evaluation serves as the basis for recommending annual merit salary increases. Expectations for performance will be based on approved workload expectations for the respective academic year. Workload expectations should reflect goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the coming year and to establish priorities. Annual goals should be challenging, realistic, and support the mission and goals of the department, college and university.

   b. Each Committee member will vote by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes will be tallied by the PTRM Committee chair. A simple majority vote is required to recommend reappointment, unless the candidate has agreed to other terms at the time of his/her original appointment. The full committee of 4 tenured and 1 clinical faculty must be present to vote. Tenured faculty is defined as those who have been granted tenure. Clinical faculty refers to clinical instructors, clinical assistant professors, clinical associate professors and clinical professors. Tie votes are settled by re-voting until the tie is resolved. As stipulated by the ART policy, the PTRM chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and committee’s recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Health Professions.

   c. Factors to be considered in evaluating faculty performance: quality and consistency of performance; ability to innovate; demonstration of initiative;
leadership skills; ability to work effectively with others; ability to organize work and complete responsibilities promptly; ability to relate performance areas to the more general, goals of the department, college and/or university;
dependability; professional attitude; adaptability and demonstrated commitment to the mission of the department, college and university.

d. Department RM Committee members will use annual review recommendations to rate each faculty member’s performance in (a) Teaching, (2) Scholarship, and (3) Service. All three areas will be assigned ratings and reported as follows:

**Scoring System:**

3=Performance Beyond Expectations (Excellent)

2=Meets Expectations (Satisfactory)

1=Below Expectations (Not Meritorious)

- Faculty members whose RM Committee’s ratings adhere to the University Merit stipulations will receive at least Base Merit (Satisfactory).

- Faculty members who receive a rating less than “2” (Meets Expectations) in ANY of the three areas evaluated by the RM Committee, will not be eligible for Base Merit, no matter how high the other ratings are.

- Base Merit Plus (Excellent) will be assigned to faculty members whose final committee rating in at least two areas is a “3” (Performance Beyond Expectations).

f. To earn an assignment of “Excellent” for performance in any of the three areas of teaching, scholarship or service, requires that the faculty member demonstrate consistent, productive performance. Expectations for performance will be based on approved workload expectations for the respective academic year. “Excellence” is based on a consistently high level of performance and the superior nature of the contribution must be evident. The quality, innovation, sustained effort, reliability and initiative demonstrated by the faculty person are considered when assigning a rating of excellent. Characteristics of this rating may include any one or more, but are not limited to the following:

i. Accomplishes annual goals in an exemplary manner with goals that advance the department, college and/or university missions and strategic plans.
ii. Assumes new responsibilities or assignments beyond what would be expected for rank and that require a commitment of time, energy and other resources.

iii. Provides leadership or major contribution to department, college and/or university via committee work or other role.

f. The assignment of “Satisfactory” indicates the faculty member consistently and adequately fulfills the responsibilities at the respective rank. Characteristics of this rating may include any one or more, but are not limited to the following:

i. Understands and executes job responsibilities independently and thoroughly, and accomplishes a majority of his/her annual goals.

ii. Furthersthe department/college/university goals and objectives through active participation.

iii. Demonstrates knowledge of department/college/university policies and procedures and the interrelationships between levels.

g. The assignment of “Not Meritorious” indicates that the faculty does not meet minimal expectations associated with rank. Characteristics of this rating may include any one or more but are not limited to the following:

i. Does not accept or fulfill responsibilities associated with teaching/advising, scholarship and/or service;

ii. Does not perform in accordance to department’s mission, policies or procedures.

iii. Is ineffective in carrying out primary duties.

iv. Demonstrates inappropriate professional behavior.

v. Fails to work toward improving problematic performance.

B. Reappointment

1. Criteria: The Department follows the criteria outlined in this document, the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and CHP “Criteria for Evaluation”).

2. Procedures: Following review of the candidate’s portfolio by the Department RM Committee. Each Committee member will vote by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes will be tallied by the RM Committee chair. A simple majority
vote is required to recommend reappointment, unless the candidate has agreed to other terms at the time of his/her original appointment. Tie votes are settled by re-voting until the tie is resolved. As stipulated by the ART policy, the RM chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and committee’s recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost. Candidates for reappointment will be notified when the RM Committee is scheduled to meet.

The PTRM Committee chair and department chair shall be responsible for assigning committee members to visit classes of faculty requiring reappointment decisions. The PTRM chair shall be responsible for collecting the portfolio of all candidates for reappointment or tenure from the department chairperson; for conducting meetings; and for recording all recommendations made by the Committee.

C. Promotion

1. Criteria: The Department follows the criteria outlined in this document, the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and CHP “Criteria for Evaluation”).

Recommendations for promotion by the Department are based upon excellence in teaching; scholarly activities as defined by the Department and College and stipulated in “ART Policy, Appendix 3,” and service to the institution (Department, College, University and/or UM System governance), discipline and community that demonstrates collegiality and good academic citizenship.

2. Procedures: Following review of the candidate’s portfolio by the Department PT Committee, the PT Committee shall be convened by the Department PTRM Committee chair

Chair
Department of Health Science
each committee member will vote by confidential ballot signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes will be tallied by the PTRM Committee chair. A simple majority vote is required to recommend promotion, unless the candidate has agreed to other terms at the time of his/her original appointment. Tie votes are settled by re-voting until the tie is resolved. As stipulated by the ART policy, the PTRM chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and committee’s recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the dean who will forward to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until 3 years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university.

As stipulated by the ART policy, no committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. Therefore, if persons on leave or sabbatical wish to participate, it is expected they attend the meeting at which the PT Committee will deliberate on the recommendations of the PT Committee.

3. The Department PTRM Committee chair shall be responsible for assigning committee members to visit classes of tenured-track faculty; for collecting the portfolio of all candidates for reappointment or tenure from the department chair; for conducting meetings; and for recording all recommendations made by the Committee.
D. Tenure

1. **Criteria:** The Department follows the criteria outlined in this document, the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and CHP “Criteria for Evaluation”

Recommendations for tenure by the Department are based upon completion of the doctorate; excellence in teaching; scholarly activities as defined by the Department and College and stipulated in “ART Policy, Appendix 3” and; service to the institution (Department, College, University and/or UM System governance), discipline and community that demonstrates collegiality and good academic citizenship.

2. **Procedures:** Following review of the candidate’s portfolio, the Department PTRM Committee shall be convened by the Department PTRM Committee chair. This PT Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Department of Health Science. Each Committee member will vote by confidential ballot signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. Votes will be tallied by the Department PTRM Committee chair. A simple majority vote is required to recommend tenure, unless the candidate has agreed to other terms at the time of his/her original appointment. Tie votes are settled by re-voting until the tie is resolved. As stipulated by the ART policy, the Department PTRM Committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and 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 dean who will forward to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until 3 years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university.

All tenured faculty are expected to participate in a tenure vote. If a faculty person cannot attend the meeting, an alternate faculty should be present to vote according to the Towson University ART document.
ballots. A simple majority vote is required to recommend tenure, unless the candidate has agreed to other terms at the time of his/her original appointment. Tie votes are settled by re-voting until the tie is resolved.

As stipulated by the ART policy, no committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. Therefore, if persons on leave or sabbatical wish to participate, it is expected they attend the meeting at which the Committee will deliberate on the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Candidates for tenure will be notified when the PT Committee is scheduled to meet.

The Department PTRM chair shall be responsible for assigning committee members to visit classes of tenured-track faculty; for collecting the portfolio of all candidates for reappointment or tenure from the department chair; for conducting meetings; and for recording all recommendations made by the Committee.

E. Third-Year Review

1. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, the RM Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates 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. The RM Committee evaluation of a candidate’s interim progress will become part of the faculty member’s file at the department level and will be shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college RM Committee or the Provost.
2. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the RM Committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy of this document.

3. The RM Committee will evaluate the materials. The Department PTRM chair will prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service and other relevant criteria. This statement:

   a. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading to a positive promotion and tenure decision, and

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

4. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
   a. Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.

   b. Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This ranking indicates that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are 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 decision.

5. All documentation is due to the chair of the department by the third Friday in January.
6. Feedback shall be in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the Department PTRM Committee chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean.

F. Special Circumstances for Non-tenured Faculty

1. Tenure-track faculty members who may

- Have primary or equal responsibility for the care of a newborn or newly adopted child,
- Suffer from a medical illness or injuries that interfere with their ability to meet professorial responsibilities;
- Serve as primary caregiver to an elderly family member, may request a postponement of the probationary period, provided total leave for medical or care giving purposes totals at least one semester or six continuous months. The written request must be made to and approved by the Department Chair. The request for postponement shall be forwarded through the faculty member’s dean, for recommendation, to the provost for decision. Refer to the Family and Medical Leave Entitlement policy described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3.
G. Annual Review of Policies and Procedures

An annual review of the Department standards and promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit procedures will occur at a Department meeting. All Department PTRM policies and procedures will be reviewed each Fall, prior to implementation in the following Fall semester. Each year, faculty member will have an opportunity to review and recommend for consideration changes in the Department promotion, tenure, reappointment and merit policies and procedures. Recommendations for change will be submitted, in writing, to the Chair of the Department PTRM Committees no later than November 1. Recommended changes will be submitted to faculty for consideration by the Chair of the Department PTRM committees no later than November 15. A faculty meeting prior to November 30th will be called to review, discuss and vote on changes to the Department document. All faculty must vote on the changes recommended. Simple majority vote is necessary for the recommended changes to be approved. The Department PTRM document, with changes outlined, will be delivered to the college PTRM committee by the first Friday in December.

IV. PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCE FACULTY

A. Structure of the Department Promotion and Tenure (PT), Committee

The Department of Health Science Promotion and Tenure (PT): This committee is composed of all tenured faculty members in the department. The Department Chair attends the meeting but is a non-voting member.
The Committee chair shall be a tenured faculty member.

Reappointment and Merit Committee (RM): This committee is composed of (at least) 5 voting members including the PTRM Chairperson, and may include tenured faculty, tenure track faculty in their fourth year or later, and clinical faculty. At least 2 of the members must be tenured. The Department chair attends the RM meetings and participates in the discussions, but is a non-voting member. Faculty are appointed for 2 year rotating terms.

2. The Department PTRM Committee chair will be elected to serve a one-year term. Other elected faculty members, including an alternate, will be elected to serve one-year terms with the possibility of serving consecutive terms. As a citizen of the academic community, tenured faculty is expected to serve as a member of the PT and RM Committee. Service to the Department of Health Science is an important component of collegiality and shared governance.

3. Elections will take place by the 1\textsuperscript{st} of May each year.

B. Duties and Procedures of Members of the Department PTRM Committee

1. Prior to the beginning of the academic year, each member of the PT and RM Committees will review the general standards and expectations as described in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3, as well as the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment & Merit Policies and Procedures as outlined in the College of Health Professions and Department of Health Science Department documents for the respective academic year.

2. The chair of the Department of Health Science PTRM Committee will be responsible for the following:

✓ Organize the PT and RM Committee’s meeting schedule;
✓
✓ Receive faculty files submitted for review;
✓ Preside over committee meetings to determine the outcome of reviews;
✓ Prepare outcome reports as stipulated by the ART Policy, Appendix 3 for each faculty member and distribute to Committee members for signature;
✓ Submit material to the Department Chair for transmittal to the Dean;
✓ Submit faculty recommendations for changes to policies and/or procedures for consideration by the Department no later than November 15.

4. The Department PTRM Committee chair will complete the Departmental Summary Recommendation (DSR) Form for all persons at the rank being considered, and assure appropriate signatures are obtained. A candidate’s signature indicates only that the faculty member has read the Department’s Summary form recommendation. If the faculty member disagrees with the decision, an appeals process may be initiated. (See Section IV (D) “Appeal for PTRM Decisions” in this document and refer to the current ART Policy,
Appendix 3 for a description of the procedures for appeal.) The DSR Form is sent along with the faculty portfolio to the appropriate College Promotions and Tenure Committee.

5. The Department PTRM Committee chair shall prepare a letter for each person recommended for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure and comprehensive review, setting forth the respective Committee’s reasons for supporting the recommended action and referring to the Department, College, and University expectations as a basis for the decision. This letter shall be signed by each committee member. The final vote will be recorded in the letter. The letter shall be submitted to the Department Chair by the 2nd Friday in October and shall be placed in the summative portfolio by the Department Chair.

6. The Department Chair may prepare an independent recommendation of each faculty member up for reappointment and annual review. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent recommendation for all tenure decisions, third and five-year comprehensive reviews and include it in the faculty member’s summative portfolio by the 4th Friday in October.

7. Upon request of the faculty member, external evaluations may be conducted as part of a Health Science faculty member’s tenure or promotion evaluation. The evaluation must comply with University policy on external evaluations. Faculty must submit such requests in writing to both the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Department PT and RM Committees by no later than February 1st of the calendar year in which the tenure and/or promotion evaluation will occur.

C. Process for Reviewing Faculty Portfolios

Each faculty member chooses a mentor from department faculty based on professional and personal preferences. The mentor provides advice and counsel to the mentee on issues related to performance, tenure and promotion. A faculty
member will have the option of asking his/her faculty mentor to meet with the PT and RM Committees to hear Committee member views on the faculty member’s performance and receive feedback that the mentor will communicate to the mentee.

1. The meeting with the PT and RM Committees will occur only after the committee has completed its review of the faculty. The faculty member under review will not be present during PT and RM Committee’s deliberations of the respective faculty member’s performance.

2. Department PT and RM Committee deliberations will be closed and held confidential. Deliberation information will not be discussed after the meeting with any person. Results of votes will be recorded and reported to the faculty member under review, as stipulated by the ART policy.

3. Faculty who intend to be candidates for promotion and/or tenure, clinical faculty include, must inform the Department Chair in writing no later than 3rd Friday in September of the academic year in which the candidate will be reviewed. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to be sure all requisite peer observations have been conducted. (All members of the faculty required to have peer observations (reappointment, promotion, tenure, comprehensive review) will be informed by the Department PTRM Committee chair as to which PT and RM Committee members will be observing classroom performance by no later than the 4th Friday in September.

4. Following the completion of PT and RM Committee reviews, all portfolios are returned to the Department Chair.
5. Confidentiality

a. Committee deliberations pertinent to an individual’s reappointment, merit, tenure, and/or promotion decision will be held as confidential by all committee members. Portfolios will be open to faculty review.

b. Information concerning a reappointment, tenure, promotion or comprehensive review recommendation will be forwarded in writing to the faculty member under consideration (in person or by certified mail) and to the Chair.

6. Evaluation of Department Chair and Directors

- full time tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Department will evaluate the Department Chair using the form provided by the Dean of the College;

- program directors and coordinators will receive written feedback on their administrative roles from the Department Chair. Faculty members who have interaction with program directors and coordinators may provide feedback to the chair on their administrative performance. Administrative evaluations will be included in the P & T portfolios for those holding the administrative positions.

8. Policies and Procedures regarding Student Evaluations

a. The results of student evaluations are reported on AR, Part I form.

b. The Student Evaluation Form will be given to each class that has an enrollment of five or more students (on load, off load, minimester, summer semesters) adhering to all course evaluation procedures for students. Student Evaluations are conducted by the University’s Office of Assessment, using an online evaluation format approved by the University.

c. The Student Evaluations shall be included in the Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness statement that shall include an insightful, reflective narrative.
The narrative shall include a summative analysis of student and peer evaluations, as applicable, to identify important trends in the information, how these trends interface with the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and course objectives, and a plan of action, if any, over the next academic year. Faculty is encouraged to communicate anomalies and plan of action.

d. The faculty member will not review student evaluation reports until final grades for all classes taught by the faculty member have been submitted to the Registrar’s Office and Department Chair’s Office. Reports of student evaluations and any qualitative comments from students will be available to faculty after data has been compiled by Office of Assessment and grades have been submitted to the Registrar’s Office.

e. Faculty members are to maintain integrity and not engage in activities that would bias student feedback.

8. Peer Observation Policies and Procedures

a. All faculty must be observed per University policy. Non-tenured faculty (tenure-track and clinical) must be observed at least once every regular academic term by two members of the Department PT or RM Committee. Tenured faculty must be observed at least once every five (5) years by two members of the Department PT or RM Committee. The PTRM Committee chair will be responsible for assigning committee members to visit classes. The faculty member to be observed must be notified at least a week in advance of the scheduled visit, unless that interval is mutually waived. If a serious question arises in regard to the faculty’s ability in the classroom, the Department PTRM committee chair shall arrange for additional observation visits.
b. The following guidelines will be followed for classroom observations:

(i) Classroom observations should be, at least, 50 minutes in duration. Courtesy suggests that the observer attempt to be in the room prior to the beginning of the class to be observed.

(ii) The observer is encouraged to review, in advance, the course syllabus, and all other pertinent information of the faculty member being observed. Observers are also encouraged to interview the faculty member about his/her philosophy and teaching style so that the observation can be seen from that perspective.

(iii) The observer is expected to give his/her undivided attention to the classroom activities being observed.

(iv) The observing faculty member will bring a copy of the Faculty Observation Form to the classroom session.

(v) Classroom observations may be performed at any time (with a week prior notice) during the semester.

(vi) The Faculty Observation Form must be completed and discussed with the faculty person within five (5) business days after the classroom visit. Both the observer and faculty person observed will sign the report. An original and a copy of the completed form will be given to the Department Chair for inclusion in the faculty member’s file. The faculty member who has been observed should also be provided a copy of the signed form for his/her files.

(vii) It is the policy of the Department to notify any and all faculty members who fail to complete a peer observation of classroom teaching as
prescribed in the above sections of this document, that such violations of the policy will be noted and reported by the Department Chair. The notification will be kept on file in the office of the Department Chair.

D. Appeal for Promotion and Tenure Decisions (Refer to current ART Policy, Appendix 3)

1. Criteria: The Department follows the criteria as outlined in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3.

2. Procedures:

   a. The Department will follow the general appeal procedures as outlined in the current ART Policy, Appendix 3 and the CHP policy on appeals.
Health Science Workload Expectations

Basis of Workload Expectations for the Health Science Department:

The Faculty of the Health Science Department has developed the following expectations for faculty workload. Each faculty will propose their workload and percentages for each of the three areas – teaching, scholarship and service – based upon the following standards. After consultation with the Department Chair, an individual’s workload will be finalized at the department level and submitted to the College Dean for final approval. It is recognized that, within each faculty “role” below there will be negotiation about the specifics of the workload. This negotiation will occur primarily at the Departmental level with the Chair and be based upon not only the interest of the faculty and the needs of the department, but the history of accomplishments in previous years (if applicable).

Teaching and Advising Minimum Expectations:

At minimum, tenure-track/tenured faculty shall demonstrate:

- knowledge of the emerging needs in one’s field/discipline;
- refinement, updates & improvements in courses one teaches using student and peer evaluations to guide/inform changes;
- a commitment to participation in effective student advising;
- effective & successful participation in course and/or program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice and/or sustained experience in one's field/discipline.
- Teaching may also include development of materials for new course preparation and instruction; development of innovative teaching strategies for course instruction, curriculum projects and/or software/hardware.
Scholarship and Service **Minimum Expectations** for Each Assignment Category:

A. Scholar-Teacher, Including New Faculty (3-3 Load)

   Scholarship:  3 activities, at a minimum, from list (A) or 2 activities from list (A) and 2 activities from list (B) depending on scholarship focus
   Service: 3 from Service List

B. Teacher – Scholar (3-4 Load)

   Scholarship:  2 activities from (A) or (B) depending on scholarship focus
   Service: 3 from Service List

C. Educator-Mentor (4-4 Load)

   Scholarship:  1 from (A) or (B) depending on scholarship focus
   Service: 2 from Service List

**Scholarship Categories:**

The quality and complexity of a given piece of scholarship should be kept in mind as one submits materials for scholarship. The key concepts here are: **submission, transmission, and peer-validation** of one’s work.

Each faculty members' future workload agreements are tied to the Department annual review. Faculty who are not meeting "excellent" scholarship expectations for two years in a row will meet with the Chair and potentially have their teaching or service loads increased. Similarly, faculty who fulfill their scholarship expectations by consistently earning 'excellent' ratings 2 years in a row can request to reduce their teaching or service load in future years.

**List A:**

- Publication of one peer-reviewed journal article, or submission of 2 articles to peer reviewed journals as first, second, or third author, unless authors listed alphabetically.
- Book author or editor.
• Book chapter, technical report, or equivalent.

• Presentation at a national or regional professional educational or scientific conference that has been peer reviewed as first, second, or third author, unless authors listed alphabetically.

• Keynote speaker at a national scientific or professional conference

• Invited paper presentation at national or regional educational or scientific conference.

☐ Scholarly journal reviewer/editor of 3 or more manuscripts

• Scholarly reviewer/editor of a book.

• Editor of peer-reviewed journal

• Principal-Investigator, Co-Investigator or equivalent on external grant or contract of more than $30,000

• Scholarly reviewer or program evaluator for a grant.

List B:

Activities to enhance professional expertise as required by clinical and lecturer position

Evidence of substantial work on an ongoing project

Chairing or serving on a professional board that produces a scholarly product

• Development and transmission of innovative teaching materials (including film/DVD, web-based or print).

• Poster presentation at national or regional professional educational or scientific conference.

• Publication of non-peer reviewed article in professional journal.

• Scholarly journal reviewer/editor of 2 or fewer manuscripts.

• Reviewer of scholarly materials proposed for professional continuing education (e.g., refereed Annual Meetings, Continuing Education Institutes, etc.)

• Grant proposal submission as PI, Co-PI or equivalent to regional or national funding source;

• Funding for grant proposal or contract of less than $30,000.

• Evaluation or assessment of teaching approach/material.

• Professional presentation of findings or short publication in professional journal.

Professional reviewer of Academic program with academic/professional outcome.
Service Categories: Service opportunities vary by discipline and are often a matter of timing. Some service activities are more labor intensive than others. When assessing service, one should keep in mind the level of involvement and amount of time devoted to these activities.

- Officer or Committee Chair of National, Regional or Statewide Professional Organization
- Board Member of National Organization
- University-Wide Committee Chair or University Senate Member
- Program Director or Chair of Program Development Committee for future academic program
- Civic Service (including local to international service to advance the mission of the university
- Lead authorship on self-studies for program certification and accreditation.
- Designated mentor, three or more faculty.
- Executive Board of USM or MHEC Committees.
- Committee membership in national, state, regional professional organization.
- Committee member of College or University-wide committee (including Search Committees)
- Board member of local professional organization
- Program committee membership (including assessment committees, planning committees, department committees).
- Student organization faculty advisor
- Ad hoc committee service on campus or community –wide basis.
- Service on USM or MHEC Committees.
- Other service assignments as negotiated with Department Chair,
APPENDIX B

FACULTY OBSERVATION FORM

Academic Year Being Evaluated ___________

Date: ___________________ Observer Signature_____________________________

Class _______________ Faculty Signature _________________________

Interview Date: ______________________________

Note: 1= poor; 2= fair; 3= good; 4= very good; 5= excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas Encouraged for Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation Organization:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery of Presentation:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication Skills

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods Used (list)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______________</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rapport With Students

(Kept students interested, elicited and answered questions. Actively involved students)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment of the presentation _______ points

General Summation of Comments for Consideration by the Faculty Member
APPENDIX C

Annual Review FORMS

Parts I & II

[Forms included will be those that have been approved for use by the UPT.]
ANNUAL REPORT (AR)
Part I
Reporting On Activities For Academic Year
June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

Name ___________________________ Rank ___________________________

Department of ___________________________

Area of Specialization ___________________________

Appointed to TU faculty: at rank ______________ in year ____________

Promotion History:

To rank ______________ in year ____________,
To rank ______________ in year ____________, and
To rank ______________ in year ____________.

I. Formal Degrees

A. Highest degree earned, with date and name of granting institution. If received since June 1, 20__, attach proof.

B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1, 20__ and present status. Corroborative material and/or transcript must be attached.

II. Teaching (percentage of workload: ______%)

A. 1. Attach evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment (If your department or college uses an alternative or additional course evaluation survey that has been approved by the UPTRM, then you may also include those results). The course evaluation reports from the Office of Assessment will each include the course title and number, credit hours, number of students enrolled/responding, and response data for each item (median, mean, standard deviation, N).

2. You may, if you wish, include a narrative statement on your teaching that includes your interpretation of the course evaluations and how you intend to use the results to inform and improve your teaching.

3. Insert below your class GPA and grade distribution. These data are provided to your dean’s office by the Office of Institutional Research (Fall data are sent in February and Spring data are sent in mid June). Your dean’s office will distribute these data to departments. You may fill out this table by indicating the number of students in each grade category, or you may electronically insert the information by cutting and pasting the entire section from the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Dist</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Attach syllabi for all courses listed (must contain all elements required for syllabi in Policies and Procedures for the Classroom: Course Syllabus).

B. Non-classroom assignments which are part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers).

C. New instructional procedures which you have introduced this year (special projects, new courses and/or materials).

D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain.

III. Scholarship

[Attach corroborative material where appropriate]

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain.

IV. Service

[Indicate any of these activities which are part of your workload]

Community:

Profession:

University (all levels):

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain
ANNUAL REVIEW (AR)
PART II
Agreement On Faculty Workload Expectations For Academic Year
June 1, ____ - May 31, ____

I. Teaching (percentage of workload: ____%)
   A. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the 20__-20__ academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title/Number</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. Non-classroom assignments which will be part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers) for the 20__-20__ academic year.

   C. New instructional procedures which you plan to introduce this year (special projects, new courses and/or materials). Also include interdisciplinary, diversity, international, and new technology projects, if appropriate.

   D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

II. Scholarship (percentage of workload: ____%)

III. Service (percentage of workload: ____%)

Institution:___________________________________________________________________
Discipline:___________________________________________________________________
Community:___________________________________________________________________

SIGNATURES:
Faculty Member_____________________________________ Date_________________
Chair of Department____________________________________ Date_______________
Dean of College____________________________________ Date_______________
Each faculty member will include the following table with PTRM documents.

Department of Health Science  
Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Selected Teaching Effectiveness Items from University Online Course Evaluation</th>
<th>Fall Item Median by Course</th>
<th>Spring Item Median by Course</th>
<th>Mean of item medians for Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hlth #</td>
<td>Hlth #</td>
<td>Hlth #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course was clearly organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course learning objectives were met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the requirements for course grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor explained concepts clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor assigned grades according to stated criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average course medians for Academic Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

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

The First Friday in May

Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

A. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chair and dean.

B. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

August 1 (USM mandated)

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member’s appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.

The First Friday in September

Department chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the department PTRM committee

The Second Friday in September

University PTRM committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee’s Member-at-large of the committee members and chair for the academic year.
The Third Friday in September

A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
B. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department’s PTRM committee (if necessary).
C. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 3-35
D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chair.

The Fourth Friday in September

Department chair notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member’s intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

The Second Friday in October

A. Department PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chair.
B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

The Fourth Friday in October

A. Department chair’s written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
B. The department chair will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
C. The department PTRM committee’s report with recommendations and vote count and the department chair’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
The Second Friday in November

The faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the department PTRM committee’s written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chair, are forwarded by the department PTRM chair to the dean’s office.

November 30th

A. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

B. The dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s home.

The First Friday in December

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.

The Second Friday in December

First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chair. 3-36

December 15th (USM mandated date)

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

The First Friday in January

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

B. The college PTRM committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

The Third Friday in January

A. The dean’s written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.
B. The college PTRM committee’s report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean’s recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

C. The Department PT and RM committees and chair recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.

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

E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

**The First Friday in February**

A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee’s and the dean’s recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

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

**The Second Friday in February**

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

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

C. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President. 3-37
March 1

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

First Friday in March

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

Third Friday in March

Provost’s letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTRM committee chair, department chair, and dean of the college.
APPENDIX E

CHP STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE (FROM CHP PTRM Document pp. 13-20, approved by UPT for Fall 2011)

The overarching principles that guide the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service in the College of Health Professions for annual review, comprehensive, review, promotion and tenure, and merit include the following:

Teaching

The CHP PTRM committee values a range of teaching and learning experiences for our students. The Committee acknowledges that student advising occurs in a variety of contexts including intentional advising, academic and professional guidance.

I. Teaching may take a variety of forms, including the use of technology, development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, classroom based instruction, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, emphasis on pedagogy including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment.

II. Review of teaching will consider the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.

III. Student advising roles and responsibilities are inherent in the faculty member’s teaching role. This role encompasses a range of activities such as academic advising, intentional advising, guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, and serving on a graduate research committee.

IV. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be focused on student learning which includes:

   a. Creating a climate that is conducive to learning
   b. Respecting diversity and inclusion at a variety of levels
   c. Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of the students
   d. Supporting the learning process.
Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes: student evaluations, peer evaluations (as appropriate), self-evaluation, where possible, evaluation of student learning outcomes, and the judgment related to faculty performance by evaluating bodies.

V. All courses taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be included in their evaluation of teaching. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, winter-minimester, and summer terms.

Scholarship

The CHP PTRM Committee values a wide range of scholarship activities. The committee acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship as defined by the Boyer Model.

I. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars.

II. The forms of scholarship include: the scholarship of application, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching as defined below.

   a. **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.

   b. **Scholarship of Discovery** – conducting traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.

   c. **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.

   d. **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).

III. The committee will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member and which shall include evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated.
Service

The evaluation of service for faculty members should rely on evidence of service contributions, which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service on the individual faculty member’s workload agreement. While evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of civic and/or professional service he or she may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the mission of the college and/or university, as applicable. The following are types of Service-Related Activities:

I. University Service: includes substantive participation in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and at the college and/or university level.

II. Civic Service: includes participation in the larger community (e.g., local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that are related to one’s academic area of expertise and advance the mission of the college and/or university. III. Professional Service: includes participation in professional organizations or in other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national or global), which assist in advancing the mission of the college and/or university.

**CHP PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

In accordance with the Towson University ART policy the rank of an associate professor is described as: “In addition to having the qualifications of an assistant professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and successful experience in research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of seven years of full-time university/college teaching experience. 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.” (p. 02-01.00 – 14 & 15).

I. CHP PTRM committee’s evaluation of a faculty candidate for Associate Professor
will be in compliance with the university’s criteria for the Associate Professor’s rank as stated in the TU ART document.

II. Faculty are expected to meet their department’s criteria and standards for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

Standards and Criteria for Teaching and Advising for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

I. Demonstration of knowledge of the field(s) in which they are teaching, including current and emerging trends.

II. Demonstration of refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses that one teaches.

III. Demonstration of teaching excellence and student learning as evidenced but not limited to peer and student evaluations and the faculty member’s teaching narrative.

IV. Demonstration of growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process.

V. Demonstration of effective and successful participation where appropriate in course development, program development and/or assessment that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one’s field.

VI. Demonstration of effective and successful participation in student advising.

Standards and Criteria on Scholarship for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

I. Demonstrates the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in his/her area of specialty.

II. Demonstrates 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 evolving depth and breadth in agenda and focus.

III. Demonstrates tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should include a minimum of two substantive peer reviewed items (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, grants received, authorship of books or book chapters) in addition to other scholarly activity.

Standards and Criteria on Service for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
I. A record of sustained involvement in shared governance related to committees and other activities at the Department, and College, and/or University Level.

II. A record of activities that extend beyond the routine expectations of all faculty members.

III. A record of contributions to a professional and/or community organization, and/or in a civic engagement activity in their area of professional expertise that go beyond simply being a member, and which advance the university’s mission.

**CHP PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**

In accordance with the TU ART policy the rank of Professor is described as: “In addition to having the qualifications of an associate professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and, where appropriate to the mission of Towson University, a national reputation. The appointee shall have a minimum of ten years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for faculty, who has 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.” (p. 02-01.00 – 15).

a. CHP PTRM committee’s evaluation of faculty candidates to Professor will be in compliance with the university ART description of the Professor’s rank.

b. CHP PTRM committee evaluation of a faculty candidate to Professor includes the candidate’s department criteria for tenure and promotion.

**Standards and Criteria for Teaching and Advising for Promotion to Professor**

In addition to continuing to have met the teaching and advising standards since promotion to associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following standards in teaching:

I. Demonstrated consistent excellence in teaching and advising

II. Demonstrated new teaching and/or advising challenges, which have resulted in successful outcomes
III. Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in teaching and/or advising
IV. Demonstrated leadership in an aspect teaching and/or advising

**Standards and Criteria on Scholarship for Promotion to Professor**

In addition to continuing to having met the scholarship standards since promotion to associate professor the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

I. Demonstrated a clear focus in scholarly activities.

II. Has a record of sustained scholarship that has had a substantial impact on their field of study or related to a professional issue/area

III. Shown evidence of national reputation, which may take the form of peer-reviewed publications and presentations; substantive funded grants; books; leadership in setting accreditation standards for academic programs; invitations to be a reviewer for national/international journals in the field; and/or other forms of scholarship with a major impact. This scholarship could be within the faculty member’s area of expertise or could be interdisciplinary.

IV. Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in their scholarship activities.

**Standards and Criteria on Service for Promotion to Professor**

In addition to continuing to having met the scholarship standards since promotion to associate professor the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

I. Demonstrated a sustained record of service at the department level. and at the college or university level since his/her promotion to associate professor.

II. Provided substantive leadership in a role at the department level as well as at either the college and/or university level, and/or in a professional organization, and/or as part of civic engagement.

III. Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in their service activities.
3b. Specific standards and criteria for evaluation of merit at each level

I. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. There are three (3) categories of merit.
   a. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
   b. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
   c. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

II. A rating of satisfactory shall mean at minimum that (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in 3a of this document; (b) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching as evidenced in the sources of evidence appropriate to annual review as described above; (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly work through the annual report, whether that work has been completed or is in progress; (d) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service as defined in section 3a.

III. A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of section 3a of this document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

IV. A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. Evaluation of accomplishment meriting a rating of excellent shall be made in accordance with the proportion of a faculty member's time allocated to each area of responsibility in the annual workload assignment.

V. Each department will define the above categories for use in merit deliberations, including distinctions acknowledging different workload allocations.
APPENDIX F

EXTERNAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Chapter 3 §I.B.3.f provides that departmental and college promotion and tenure policies may include an option for external reviews as part of the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. Departments and colleges are encouraged to solicit such external reviews and are directed to incorporate these guidelines into their promotion and tenure policies should external reviews be made part of the evaluation process.

I. CONFIDENTIALITY

External reviews will not be made available to the faculty member being reviewed (“Candidate”) and will not be included in the Candidate’s faculty evaluation portfolio. External reviews will be forwarded to each level of review under separate cover.

II. IDENTIFYING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Evaluators will be independent and impartial. Evaluators cannot be members of Towson University faculty nor can they be current or former advisors or mentors to the Candidate, or otherwise have (or have had) a personal or significant professional relationship with the Candidate. Evaluators must be established scholars or practitioners of demonstrated expertise in the area of the Candidate’s specialization preferably from peer institutions.

III. SELECTION OF EVALUATORS

The Candidate will have the opportunity to recommend evaluators who meet the criteria set forth in §II to the department chair or designee. The department chair or designee in consultation with the dean, will also recommend evaluators, in addition to those recommended by the faculty member. The department chair or designee will select at least 5 evaluator(s) of those recommended by the faculty member who meet the criteria set forth in §II and will select, in addition 5 other evaluator(s) so that a minimum of 10 evaluators are identified as potential evaluators.

The department chair or designee will contact the potential evaluators to identify those evaluators who agree to provide evaluations.

Potential external evaluators must be identified no later than the first Monday in April of the calendar year in which the promotion or tenure portfolio will be submitted and confirmed no later than the first Monday of July.
Following confirmation of the external evaluators, the chair or designee will write each evaluator using the letter template attached to these guidelines.

**IV. SUBJECT MATTER OF EXTERNAL REVIEW**

External evaluators are not to evaluate the candidate’s teaching, advising or service to the University. The external evaluation will address the Candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work as it relates to the Candidate’s promotion or tenure. Material provided to external evaluators should include the scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the Candidate’s discipline such as books, articles, grant proposals, computer programs, visual works or performance reviews. The Candidate’s department chair or designee must provide these materials to all external evaluators no later than July 1. The Candidate’s curriculum vitae will be included with the materials provided external evaluators.

**Sample Letter**

_Dear__________

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator of the scholarly/creative work of ____________________, ("Candidate") who is being considered for promotion from __________________ to __________________ (or who is being considered for tenure at Towson University). I am sending under separate cover the publications (and/or other materials) that I am asking you to review.

Pursuant to the University’s promotion and tenure policy, your review “will remain confidential and will not be made available to the Candidate. Only officially constituted faculty committees and academic administrators authorized to evaluate the Candidate for promotion (or tenure) will have access to your evaluation and this correspondence.

Please provide an objective assessment of the Candidate’s accomplishments as a scholar (or reference specific work in other fields as appropriate) and your opinion on whether the Candidate has demonstrated the degree of accomplishment required for promotion to __________________ (or for tenure) at __________________.

In making your evaluation of the candidate’s work, please address the following:

1. What, if any, has been your professional and/or personal relationship with the Candidate?
2. What is the significance of the issues addressed by the Candidate’s work?
3. What is your assessment of the originality and the quality of the work?
4. Is the methodology used appropriate to the issues addressed and consistent with best practices in the field?
5. Does the work produce useful lines of future inquiry for the Candidate and/or for others in the field?
6. Has the Candidate’s work appeared in journals, been exhibited in galleries, published by presses, or in professional or performance venues that are appropriate to the field that are indicators of quality work?
7. Does the body of the Candidate’s work reviewed indicate continuing development as a scholar (or creative artist)?
In addition to responding to these specific inquiries, please feel free to comment on other aspects of the Candidate’s scholarly work.

Due to the calendar for promotion and tenure decisions, please complete your review of the material and submit your evaluation by _the third Friday in September. Please address all correspondence to me at the address above, marked “Confidential.” Thank you for your assistance in this important matter. It is essential to sustaining the academic quality of Towson University that we call upon outside evaluations to assist us in judging the professional scholarship performance of our faculty. We realize how time-consuming this task is, and we are truly grateful for professional service you will render on our behalf.
APPENDIX B

FACULTY OBSERVATION FORM

Academic Year Being Evaluated ___________

Date: ___________________ Observer Signature________________________

Class _________________ Faculty Signature _________________________

Interview Date: ________________________________

Note: 1= poor; 5 excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas Encouraged for Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Presentation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Used (list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______________________            1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport With Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kept students interested, elicited and answered questions. Actively involved students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment of the presentation _______points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Summation of Comments for Consideration by the Faculty Member