

Department of Health Sciences

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit Policies and Procedures

Approved by the Department of Health Sciences 01/14/22

Approved by CHP PTRM Committee 01/25/22

Approved by University PTRM Committee 5/12/22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE(S) FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT	3
A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee and Clinical Evaluation Committee	3
B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair	3
C. Duties of the PTRM Committee Chair	3
D. How Alternates are Chosen/Vacancies Filled	3
E. Policies, Procedures, and Responsibilities of the Department Committee	4
F. Evaluation Portfolio Materials Required for Submission	5
II. REVIEW OF FACULTY	6
A. Evaluation of Teaching by Peers	6
B. Annual Review Portfolios	6
C. First Year Faculty Review Portfolios	7
D. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty	7
E. Promotion and/or Tenure Review	8
F. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Faculty	9
G. Merit Review	9
H. Appeals	10
I. Changes to the Department Promotion, Tenure, Re-appointment, and Merit Document	11
III. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE	11
A. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure	11
B. Teaching and Advising	11
C. Scholarship	13
D. Service	13
IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	13
A. Teaching and Advising for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	14
B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Tenure and/or Promotion to Assoc. Professor	14
C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	14
V. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	15
A. Standards and Criteria for Teaching and Advising for Promotion to Professor	15
B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Promotion to Professor	15
C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Promotion to Professor	16

VI. SPECIFIC STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF MERIT AT EACH LEVEL	16
A. Categories of Merit	16
B. Standards and Criteria Regarding the Evaluation of Merit	16
CALENDAR	17
APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW	24
APPENDIX B: ANNUAL REPORT (AR)	27
APPENDIX C: DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION	29
APPENDIX D: DEPARTMENT PTRM TALLY SHEET	30

Towson University
Department of Health Sciences

Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures

I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE(S) FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT

A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee and Clinical Evaluation Committee

1. All tenured faculty members in the department will serve as members of the PTRM Committee. The Department of Health Sciences Chairperson sits ex-officio and will be a non-voting member.
2. The PTRM Committee plus one elected Clinical faculty member will serve as the Clinical Evaluation Committee for evaluation of Clinical faculty for promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or a three-year contract.
3. The Clinical faculty member elected to the Clinical Evaluation Committee must be at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or higher with either a multi-year contract or three or more consecutive one-year contracts. The Clinical faculty member on the Clinical Evaluation Committee is a voting member of the committee.

B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair

1. Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty serving on the PTRM Committee.
2. The chair is elected, with nominee consent, by the PTRM Committee to a one-year term with the option for re-appointment for an additional year by the second Friday of April.

C. Duties of the PTRM Committee Chair

1. Organizing and chairing all relevant committee meetings.
2. Insuring the completion of documentation and securing necessary signatures.
3. Recording the vote count for all deliberations.
4. Submission of votes to Dean's Office.
5. Developing and distributing the faculty peer evaluation schedule.
6. Reviewing the Department of Health Sciences PTRM documents and submitting possible changes to the Department Chairperson.

D. How Alternates are Chosen/Vacancies Filled

1. If the PTRM Committee Chair is unable to serve a full term, an alternate will be elected to serve as an interim chair for the remainder of the PTRM Committee Chair's term.
2. In the event there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department when a candidate is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the committee will be supplemented with tenured faculty members from other departments within the college (or

from the appropriate department if the faculty member being reviewed has a joint appointment between colleges).

3. The additional tenured faculty members shall be selected from a list of at least three (3) faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review. The faculty member shall submit the list of recommended faculty members on or before the third Friday in June. The department chairperson and the dean will review the list from the appropriate college and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The college PTRM committee will select the additional faculty member(s) to be added to the committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.
4. In the event there are no clinical faculty members meeting the committee appointment requirements in the department when a clinical faculty candidate is being considered for promotion and/or merit, the committee will be supplemented with a clinical faculty member from another department within the college.

E. Policies, Procedures, and Responsibilities of the Department Committee

1. The PTRM Committee will review evaluation portfolios for the following types of reviews: tenure, promotion, reappointment/annual review, comprehensive five-year, third-year, three-year clinical contracts, first year (as necessary), and merit.
2. Confidentiality
 - a) Recommendations made by the Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee are dependent on the standards and expectations developed in accordance with Appendix 3 to the *Towson University ART policy (ART), University Standards and Expectations*, and the CHP Promotion and Tenure Policy document.
 - b) Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) policy.
 - c) All votes will be by a secure online balloting system or by individual confidential paper ballots, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the PTRM Committee Chair. If the chair is unavailable, another PTRM Committee member will be asked to assist tallying the votes.
3. The PTRM Committee Chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the result of the vote and the committee's recommendation to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio. The ballots shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Dean.
4. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios.
 - a) After careful review, each committee member will vote.
 - b) Tenured faculty vote on all evaluation portfolios. Clinical faculty are only eligible to vote on all Clinical faculty and evaluation portfolios.
 - c) No faculty member may be present for deliberations or voting on their own evaluation portfolio, nor evaluation portfolios for relatives, family members, or other persons indicated under Towson University's nepotism or conflict of interest policies.
 - d) All recommendations made by the committee must be made by a quorum (two-thirds of the PTRM Committee). The vote outcome will be decided by a majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed again by the entire committee and voted on a second time. If the vote remains deadlocked, a tie vote will be considered rejection of a motion.

- e) No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
 - f) Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may vote. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, they must have been present and participated in the review of materials and all discussions.
 - g) The PTRM Committee Chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. Once the department has completed deliberations about a candidate and decided on its recommendation of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate's materials are forwarded to the Dean by the date specified by the University calendar.
 - h) The Department of Health Sciences Chairperson submits a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the Department PTRM Committee's recommendation. The Department Chairperson's letter is included with the faculty candidate's documents that are forwarded to the College.
- F. Evaluation Portfolio Materials Required for Submission
1. The responsibility for preparing, organizing, and submitting materials for evaluation by the required deadline rests with the faculty member.
 2. Guided by the chairperson and the department, the college, and the university criteria, the faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as the faculty member deems appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section. In order to ensure that all materials and documentation used in making recommendations contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department standards and criteria. The type of review determines both portfolio material and process.
 3. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized according to the Provost's guidelines.
 4. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or the chairperson participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Five Year review, Three Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by the faculty member either in the evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson or program director's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in August.
 5. Faculty members under review must provide an evaluation portfolio.
 6. If the chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's portfolio, other than the recommendation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the portfolio.
 7. If at any level confidential, external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but forwarded separately to each level of review.

II. REVIEW OF FACULTY

A. Evaluation of Teaching by Peers

1. Evaluation of courses is encouraged for purposes of professional growth and is required as indicated below.
2. Peer review of teaching is required according to the following schedule:
 - a) Tenure-track faculty – two reviews per year.
 - b) Tenured faculty – two reviews conducted during the five-year review period (one must be during the year immediately prior to review).
 - c) Clinical faculty – two reviews per year for the first three years.
 - d) Clinical faculty – one review per year after the initial three-year period.
 - e) Clinical faculty – two reviews in the year prior to review for promotion.

B. Annual Review Portfolios

1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical, faculty must include the following documents for activities that occurred between June 1st and May 31st. Documents are due to the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in June.
2. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV, with references in current APA style and accomplishments highlighted for the period under review
- One representative document of scholarly activity during the academic year.

Section II:

- Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR) (parts I & II) for the year under review (AR II for forthcoming academic year is not required)
- If applicable, evidence of Continuing Education Units (CEU), current certifications, and/or licensure, and clinical practice

Section III:

- Teaching Narrative
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- Peer observations for the period under review
- Advising evaluations

Section IV:

- Optional integrative statement

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service

C. First Year Faculty Review

The primary purpose of this review is to evaluate a first-year faculty member's performance in their first semester and make a recommendation for reappointment and merit. The UPTRM unanimously passed a motion, reviewed by the Academic Senate at its 10/17/19 meeting, supporting the Provost's recommendation to modify the procedure for first year faculty review by eliminating the reappointment portfolio due in December. According to this recommendation: In lieu of a December portfolio submission and committee review, the department chair will review all relevant documentation for first-year faculty, including CV, teaching, and peer evaluations; meet with the candidate to discuss the review; and make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment to the Department PTRM Committee. Should the Chair's recommendation be for non-reappointment, the Department PTRM committee will convene to review the relevant documentation and vote in accordance with standard PTRM procedure and report the outcome no later than the third Friday in February. Chair and Department PTRM recommendations will advance to the College Dean by that same day. The Dean shall advance their recommendations to the Provost no later than by the fourth Friday in February. This revised review process is a permanent change and will be the standard procedure moving forward.

D. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. By the third Friday in January of a candidate's third year at Towson University, the PTRM Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure track candidates to assess progress toward tenure and to advise 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 PTRM Committee evaluation of a candidate's progress will only become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and will be shared with the Dean.
2. The candidate's materials reflecting work through their third Fall semester are required for this review and should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV
 - with references in current APA style
 - highlight accomplishments for the period under review
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms (Appendix B) arranged from most recent to year of hire.

Section III:

- Teaching Narrative
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations (if available)

Section IV:

- Integrative Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. This

statement should be no more than five pages in length. The statement should include a clear scholarship plan outlining the activities and progress towards meeting the criteria and standards for promotion.

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
3. After evaluation of the third-year review portfolio, 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 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 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:
 - (1) *Superior progress*. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
 - (2) *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 may be needed.
 - (3) *Needs Improvement*. This evaluation requires change by the faculty member across one or more dimensions, because the current performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.
 5. Written feedback to the faculty member shall be provided during a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the Department PTRM Committee chair no later than the first Friday in March. The Dean receives a copy of the written report.

E. Promotion and/or Tenure Review

1. Guided by the TU ART, this review occurs following the timeline agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the Provost's Office. The purpose of this review is to assess the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the standards and expectations delineated in the TU ART and the CHP and Department PTRM documents. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows (unless specified differently in the annual Provost's memo):

Section I:

- Updated CV
 - with references in current APA style
 - highlight accomplishments for the period under review
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms (Appendix B) arranged from most recent to year of hire.

Section III:

- Teaching Narrative
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores

- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations

Section IV:

- Integrative Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement should include a clear scholarship plan outlining activities and goals for the next five years. This statement should be no more than five pages in length.

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service

F. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty

1. Once every five years, based on the established schedule for review, there shall be 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 document.
2. Materials used for the comprehensive review are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review, above. (ARs since last promotion should be provided.)

G. Merit Review

1. Merit decisions shall be concurrent with annual review. The review shall follow policies, standards, and procedures outlined in the department's merit policy.
2. In order to receive a recommendation of Excellent, a faculty member must be rated as Excellent in a minimum of two evaluation categories (teaching, scholarship, service) and Satisfactory in the remaining evaluation category.
3. The merit appeal process shall follow the same protocol as the appeal process. (Refer to the current TU ART Policy for procedures related to appeal.)

H. Appeals

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter. There are three (3) types of appeals.

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either Department and/or College PTRM Committees, the Department Chairperson, the Dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
 - a) The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the CHP PTRM, Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

- b) The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and may be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on the faculty member's performance.
 - c) Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the Department Chair and the Department PTRM Chair. Appeals of CHP recommendations shall be copied to the CHP Dean and the CHP PTRM Committee.
 - d) All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM Committee Chair or the Dean.
 - e) Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the CHP PTRM Committee, the university PTRM Committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this letter will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - f) Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President, whose decision is final.
2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
- a) All procedural appeals must be made to the University PTRM Committee.
 - b) Appeals should address the procedural issues that led to negative decisions regarding merit, promotion, tenure, and/or comprehensive review. The appeal must be in writing, accompanied with supporting documents and delivered via certified mail or in person to the Dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days following notification of a negative recommendation.
 - c) University PTRM Committee will review the appeal within fifteen (15) business days of a formal appeal. A decision will be sent to the faculty member with copies provided to all parties included on the original appeal letter.
 - d) Recommendations made by the University PTRM Committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The University PTRM Committee chair will oversee this process.
3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.
- I. Changes to the Department Promotion, Tenure, Re-appointment, and Merit Document

All changes to the Department of Health Sciences PTRM policies and procedures document must be approved by the Department faculty and forwarded to the CHP PTRM committee by the 2nd Friday in October.

- 1. Changes can be voted on by all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- 2. Changes are approved by a simple majority of those eligible to vote.

III. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

A. Guidelines for promotion and tenure must be met at the department, college and university level. Department guidelines are outlined below:

1. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall fulfill the workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours, and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
2. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
3. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
4. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship as described in the TU ART, Appendix 3, II.B.d.
5. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance.
6. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described herein.

B. Teaching and Advising

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

1. Teaching effectiveness shall be based on student evaluations as administered and tabulated by TU Institutional Research, 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 engaging in honest self-evaluation;
 - c) Demonstrating competency as reflected in peer and student evaluations;
 - d) Preparing syllabi for each course in accordance with university and department standards.
 - e) Additionally, all faculty should consult college and university guidelines.
2. Teaching may take a variety of forms, including the following:
 - a) Classroom-based instruction,
 - b) Development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement),
 - c) Faculty exchanges and teaching abroad,

- d) Off-site-learning,
 - e) Appropriate use of educational technology,
 - f) Supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation,
 - g) Emphasis on pedagogy including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum,
 - h) Other aspects of learning and its assessment.
3. Review of teaching will consider the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.
 4. Student advising roles and responsibilities are inherent in the faculty member's teaching role. This role encompasses a range of activities, such as:
 - a) Academic advising,
 - b) Intentional advising (e.g. career & graduate education planning, recommendation writing, networking events, major/minor declarations, research guidance),
 - c) Guidance of students in the learning process within one's class teaching responsibilities,
 - d) Advising groups in academic honor societies and other student groups,
 - e) Serving on an undergraduate or graduate research committee.
 5. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be focused on student learning which includes:
 - a) Creating a supportive 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,
 - e) Encouraging subject mastery.
 6. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:
 - a) Peer evaluations,
 - b) Student evaluations,
 - c) A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations,
 - d) Evaluation of student learning outcomes,
 - e) Other sources of teaching and mentoring evaluation including professional societies and awards.
 7. All on-load courses taught by faculty shall be included in their evaluation of teaching. This includes all on-load as defined by the Department of Health Sciences, on-line, classroom, clinical/fieldwork and hybrid courses taught during the academic year. Faculty may choose to include off-load course evaluations.

C. Scholarship

The Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee values a wide range of scholarship activities. The committee acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship.

1. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars. Faculty are expected to develop a focus area(s) with a number of peer-reviewed publications.
2. The committee will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member, which shall include evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated.
3. Review of scholarship will consider the allocation of faculty time devoted to scholarship as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.

4. Additionally, all faculty should consult college and university guidelines.

D. 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.

1. While evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of civic and community/or professional service he or she may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the mission of the department, college and/or university, as applicable.
3. The following are types of Service-Related Activities:
 - a) University Service: includes substantive participation and/or leadership in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and at the college and/or university level.
 - b) Professional Service: includes participation and/or leadership 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 discipline.
 - c) Civic and Community Service: includes participation and/or leadership 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.
4. Additionally, all faculty should consult college and university guidelines.

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In accordance with the TU 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 six 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. 0201.00 – 14 & 15).

Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee's evaluation of a faculty candidate for Associate Professor will comply with the college and university's criteria.

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

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

1. Demonstration of knowledge of the field(s) in which they are teaching, including current and emerging trends.
2. Demonstration of refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses that one teaches.

3. Demonstration of teaching excellence and student learning as evidenced by but not limited to peer and student evaluations and the faculty member's teaching narrative.
4. Demonstration of growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process.
5. 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.
6. Demonstration of effective and successful participation in student advising.

B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Demonstration of the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in the area(s) of specialty.
2. Demonstration of a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda. The candidate's scholarship shall reflect evolving depth and breadth in agenda and focus.
3. Demonstration of tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should include a number of peer-reviewed publications and substantive scholarly activity (e.g., grants received, authorship of books or book chapters).

C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor:

1. A record of sustained involvement in shared governance related to committees and other activities at the Department, and College, and/or University Level.
2. A record of activities that extend beyond the routine expectations of all faculty members.
3. 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.

V. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES 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 have attained national distinction for comparable professional activity or research. There shall be continuing evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession.” (p. 02-01.00 – 15).

Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee’s evaluation of faculty candidates to Professor will comply with the college and university criteria.

A. 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:

1. Demonstration of consistent excellence in teaching and advising,
2. Demonstration of new teaching and/or advising challenges, which have resulted in successful outcomes,
3. Demonstration of mentoring of colleagues in teaching and/or advising,
4. Demonstration of leadership in an aspect of teaching and/or advising.

B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Promotion to Professor

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

1. Demonstration of a clear focus in scholarly activities,
2. A record of sustained scholarship that has had a substantial impact on their field of study or related to a professional issue/area,
3. 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.
4. Demonstration of mentoring of colleagues in their scholarship activities.
5. Letters of evaluation from external reviewers, which will be solicited from outside the University pursuant to the Guidelines approved by the University Senate (See Appendix A).

C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Promotion to Professor

In addition to continuing to have met the service standards since promotion to Associate Professor the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

1. Demonstration of a sustained record of service at the department level and at the college or university level since their promotion to associate professor.
2. Substantive leadership in a role at the department level, the college or university level, as well as at the professional level or as part of civic engagement.
3. Demonstration of mentoring of colleagues in their service activities.

VI. SPECIFIC STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF MERIT AT EACH LEVEL

A. Categories of Merit

Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. There are three (3) categories of merit:

1. Needs Improvement: Performance fails to meet standards.
2. Satisfactory: Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, College, and Department.
3. Excellent: Excellence in a minimum of two evaluation categories (teaching, scholarship, or service) and Satisfactory in the remaining evaluation category.

B. Standards and Criteria Regarding the Evaluation of Merit

1. A rating of Needs Improvement shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of their rank and/or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.
2. A rating of Satisfactory shall mean at minimum that (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities of their rank; (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 appropriate for their rank.
3. 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 excellence in a minimum of two evaluation categories and Satisfactory in the remaining evaluation category. Evaluation of accomplishment shall be made in accordance with the standards for tenure track or clinical faculty.

VII. CALENDAR (See also University Calendar from TU ART Document)

(Also referenced: First Year Flowchart UPTRM Website:

<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/uptrm/firstyearflowchart.pdf>)

A. Second Friday in April

Election for a representative to the College PTRM Committee and their alternate for the upcoming academic year will be conducted. These members will serve a three-year term.

B. First Friday in May

Election for Chair of Health Sciences Department PTRM Committee; Department and College PTRM Committees are formed (elections for membership on the College committee are already completed).

C. Third Friday in June

1. All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson.
2. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and Dean.
3. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chairperson and Dean of the written professional development plan.

D. August 1 (USM Mandated)

1. 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.
2. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

E. First Friday in September

Department Chairperson approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department Tenure and/or Promotion Committee.

F. 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 chairperson for the academic year.

G. Third Friday in September

1. Faculty notify Department Chairperson by letter with copy to the Dean of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
2. College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).

3. 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.
4. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure Track Faculty (SENTF) with the Department Chairperson.

H. Fourth Friday in September

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

I. Second Friday in October

1. Department PTRM Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.
2. College PTRM documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.
3. Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTRM Committee if any changes have been made.

J. Fourth Friday in October

1. Department Chairperson'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.
2. The Department Chairperson will place the independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
3. The Department PTRM Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

K. 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, completed Department Summary Recommendation Form (Appendix C), Department Vote Record (Appendix D), and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department PTRM Chairperson to the Dean's office.

L. November 30th

1. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
2. 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.
3. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

M. The First Friday in December

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

N. December 15th (USM Mandated)

1. 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.
2. The College PTRM Committee will conduct a review of promotion and tenure materials submitted to the College during and/or immediately following the final exam periods and hold possibly one meeting at the beginning of January, if needed.

O. First Friday in January

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

P. Third Friday in January

1. The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
2. The College PTRM Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
3. All documentation for the Third Year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted for evaluation by the faculty member.

Q. First Friday in February

1. 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.
2. The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the Department recommendation, the Dean shall prepare a recommendation, send a copy to the faculty member, and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.
3. The Department PTRM Committee and Chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment and merit for first-year faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.
4. Department Chairperson recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
5. If first-year faculty recommendation is for non-reappointment, Chair forwards all materials to the Department PTRM Committee and Dean and notifies faculty.
6. All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson.

R. Second Friday in February

1. The Dean will, following the review, forwards Department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the Department recommendation, the Dean shall add a recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative recommendation in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.
 2. 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.
 3. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.
- S. Third Friday in February
1. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Department PTRM Committee to Faculty, Chair, Dean, and Provost; Provost notifies President. Faculty can begin to prepare their appeal to the President.
- T. Fourth Friday in February
1. Dean makes recommendation for first-year faculty appointment or non-reappointment to Faculty, Chair, Department PTRM, and Provost.
- U. March 1st
1. If first-year faculty reappointed, Provost notifies faculty, Chair, Department PTRM Committee, and Dean.
 2. If first-year faculty not reappointed, faculty is notified in writing by the President by 1 March. Faculty can present an appeal to the President within 10 business days.
- V. First Friday in March
- Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.
- W. Third Friday in March

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College PTRM Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and Dean of the College.

APPENDIX A: GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/documents/externalevaluationguidelineswithletter_finaldraft.pdf

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 Chairperson or designee.
- The Department Chairperson or designee in consultation with the Dean, will also recommend evaluators, in addition to those recommended by the faculty member. The Department Chairperson 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 Chairperson 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 Chairperson 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.
- Template Letter for Requesting External Reviewers

Date

Dr.
Department of
Towson University
8000 York Road
Towson, Maryland 21252

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 _____ (and/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.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX B: ANNUAL REPORT (AR)

Part I

Reporting On Activities For Academic Year

June 1, 20XX - May 31, 20XX

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, 2017, attach proof.

- B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1, 2017 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.

Grade Dist	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	D+	D	F	Total	FX	W	O	Median	Mean
Course																

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 2017-2018, please explain.

III. Scholarship (percentage of workload: ____%)

[Attach corroborative material where appropriate]

- A. Publications
 - 1. Peer reviewed publications (list using format at the end of this AR Part I form).
 - 2. Non-peer-reviewed publications (list using format at the end of this AR Part I form).
 - 3. Non-peer reviewed abstracts (list using format at the end of this AR Part I form).
- B. Presentations

Information about the role at given meeting is given with the recommended citation described at the end of this AR Part I form.

C. Grants and Contracts

Information about the grant is given with the recommended citation described at the end of this AR Part I form.

D. Others

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 2017-2018, please explain.

IV. Service (percentage of workload: ____%)

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

Institution:

Discipline:

Community:

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 2017-2018, please explain.

ANNUAL REVIEW (AR)

Part II

Agreement On Faculty Workload Expectations For Academic Year

June 1, 20XX - May 31, 20XX

I. Teaching (percentage of workload: ____%)

- A. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the 2018-2019 academic year.
- 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 2018-2019 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: ____%)

II. Service (percentage of workload: ____%)

[For any of these activities which are part of your workload, please indicate.]

Institution:

Discipline:

Community:

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member _____

Date _____

Chairperson of Department _____

Date _____

Dean of College _____

Date _____

APPENDIX C

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF _____

RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____

(Faculty Member)

This form is to be completed for all tenure track and clinical faculty by each department upon the conclusion of its PTRM process each fall. When promotion or tenure is being considered, it is forwarded as part of the faculty member's file to the appropriate college promotion and tenure committee for use during its deliberations. Recommendations on merit, reappointment, and five year comprehensive reviews are to be forwarded directly from the department to the dean of the college.

By signing this form faculty members indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendation(s); their signatures do not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendation(s). Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendation(s) should follow procedures found in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty.

The _____ Department PTRM Committee voted to recommend that you have:

- Tenure granted
- Tenure denied

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following:

Promotion to T/TT or Clinical:

- Associate Professor
- Professor
- No promotion

The _____ Department Merit Committee recommends you for the following:

- Needs Improvement
- Satisfactory
- Excellent

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:

- Reappointed
- Not reappointed

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends that your performance for the period covered by the Five Year Comprehensive Review be judged:

- Satisfactory
- Less than Satisfactory

Committee Chair Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty Member Signature _____ Date _____

In the event of multiple decisions made by different committees with different committee chairs, those committee chairs should add their signatures on the backside of this form.

7/11/2013

Health Sciences Dept: updated merit categories 1/5/22

APPENDIX D

Department of _____

Promotion, Tenure & Reappointment Committees and Annual Review and Merit Committees Votes
Fall _____ (based on Academic Year _____)

Faculty (Rank)		Tenure/ Reappoint Vote	Promote Vote	5 YR Review	Merit Review	Merit Teaching Vote	Merit Scholarship Vote	Merit Service Vote	Merit Overall Decision
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				Needs improvement				
	No				Satisfactory				