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In conformity with the Towson University Faculty Handbook, the Department of Kinesiology Promotion, Tenure, Rank and Merit Committees administer the systems of faculty evaluation by implementing the provisions set forth in the document “Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty” (ART, August 2010).

Please note chairperson as used in this document refers to department chair unless otherwise stated.

1. Department Committee(s) for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit
   a. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee
      i. All tenured faculty and Clinical Associate Professor of the department serve as members of the department’s PTRM committee. The department chairperson will be a non-voting member.
      ii. In a circumstance when a minimum of two clinical associate professors are unavailable to serve on the PTRM committee, clinical faculty members who have been successfully reappointed and possess a record of positive annual reviews, may be selected to attend PTRM deliberations on clinical faculty.
   b. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair
      i. Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty serving on the PTRM committee.
      ii. The chair and vice chair positions are elected, with nominee consent, by the PTRM committee to a one-year term by the second Friday of April.
      iii. The term of service for both positions is one year. The vice chair will serve as the PTRM chair during the following academic year.
   c. How alternates are chosen/vacancies filled
      i. If the PTRM committee chair is unable to serve a full term, the vice chair will serve as an interim chair for the remainder of the chairperson’s term, and continue on to fulfill their chairperson responsibilities the following year. If the vice chair is unable to serve, an interim chair will be elected by a vote of all tenured faculty.

2. Policies, procedures, and responsibilities of the Department PTRM Committee
   a. 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, and merit.
b. Confidentiality
   i. 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 ART policy.
   ii. All votes will be by individual secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the PTRM committee chair and the vice chair. If one is not available, another PTRM committee member will be asked to assist tallying the votes.
   iii. 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 secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the faculty member’s file until three (3) years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university.

c. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios
   i. Recommendations made by the department 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.
   ii. After careful review, each committee member will vote.
      • All tenured faculty vote on all evaluation portfolios. Clinical faculty are only eligible to vote on all clinical faculty and lecturer evaluation portfolios. In a circumstance when a clinical assistant professor is on the PTRM committee, s/he may only vote on clinical faculty evaluation portfolios.
      • 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.
      • All recommendations made by the committees must be made by a quorum; the outcome will be decided by the majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed again by the entire committee and voted on a second time. If the vote remains deadlocked, a tie vote will be considered rejection of a motion.
   iii. 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.
   iv. 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.
v. The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee’s recommendations to the next level of review.

vi. 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 (see TU ART Appendix 3, p. 25 Section 6H & 6J, the Department Chairperson submits “a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the Department’s PTRM Committee’s recommendation”, the letter is included with the faculty candidate’s documents that are forwarded to the College PTRM Committee) and the departmental PTRM documents including the Evaluation Record regarding the candidate are forwarded by the department PTRM committee chairperson(s) to the Dean’s office in the specified format (refer to Appendix C to this document) by the second Friday in November.

vii. Negative recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure shall be delivered in writing in person or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are being distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

d. Definition of Quorum

i. Quorum for the Department PTRM committee consists of at least 80% of the committee membership.

e. Evaluation Portfolio materials required for submission

i. The responsibility for preparing, organizing, and submitting materials for evaluation by the required deadline rests with the faculty member.

ii. 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 s/he deems appropriate in his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

iii. In order to ensure that all material 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.

iv. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review.
v. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or his/her chairperson or program director 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 either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson’s 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. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Five Year review, Three Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar.

vi. If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, other than his/her evaluation, 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.

vii. 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 under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member’s notification shall be tracked via the PTRM document review transmittal form (see TU ART doc). A failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

viii. Annual Review Portfolios

   Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer faculty must include the following documents for activities that occurred between June 1 to May 31. Documents are organized in the following way in a 1-inch binder which is due to the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in June.

   1. Section I:
      a. Updated CV
      b. Summary of scholarship followed by documentation of scholarship
      c. Continuing Education documentation for hours earned, if needed

   2. Section II:
a. Completed and signed AR or CAR (parts I & II) for the year under review

3. Section III:
   a. Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores (see Appendix B for template/example)
   b. Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
   c. Syllabi for courses taught during the year under review
   d. Grade distributions for courses taught during the year under review
   e. Peer evaluations, if observed during the year under review (see Appendix A for template)

4. Section IV:
   a. Documentation of service associated with roles within the Department of Kinesiology, the College of Health Professions, Towson University, profession and discipline-specific activities, and community-wide activities

5. Section V:
   a. Recommendations

ix. First Year Faculty Review Portfolios
    First year reviews occur at the end of the first semester for tenure-track, clinical and lecturer faculty. First year faculty submit an evaluation portfolio of their first semester of work using the same organization as the Annual Review Portfolio. This portfolio is due to the Department Chair by the 2nd Friday in December.

x. Tenure & Promotion Reviews, 5-Year Comprehensive Reviews, 3-Year Clinical Faculty Review, Senior Lecturer Review Portfolios
    In addition to the annual evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion, tenure, comprehensive 5-year review, a 3-year clinical faculty contract, or senior lecturer position shall prepare a 1-inch summative portfolio for the Provost and a separate 3-inch summative portfolio for the Department, College of Health Professions and Dean. Both portfolios are due to the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in June. Portfolios should be clearly labeled with the faculty member’s name, department, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents are organized from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The contents of the 1-inch summative portfolio should exactly follow the Provost’s memo which is distributed each Spring. To prepare in advance, instructions generally state that the summative portfolio is compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:
    1. Section I
       • Curriculum vita
• A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity

2. Section II
• University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Report (AR I & II) or Chairperson’s Annual Report (CAR I & II) forms arranged from most recent to the time of last promotion or year of hire.

3. Section III
• Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using the new university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time as applicable.
• Include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations. (The recommendation from the Department of Kinesiology is that this statement is no more than five pages in length.)
• For tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review, peer teaching evaluations shall be included.

4. Section IV
• Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement should also include goals and plans for the future (The recommendation from the Department of Kinesiology is that this statement is no more than five pages in length.)

5. Section V
• Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);
• Written recommendation of the department rank committee and/or tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form;
• Written recommendation of the academic chairperson;
• Written recommendation of the College PTRM committee;
• Written recommendation of the academic dean.

The 3-inch summative binder is organized identically to the 1-inch binder with the addition of the following documents:
  1. Section I: Everything listed above and
• Scholarship summary list: a list of all publications, presentations, or other creative scholarly activities that occurred during the period of review.
• Supporting documents for scholarship activities organized as follows
  o Full texts of peer-reviewed publications
  o Full texts of non-peer-reviewed publications
  o Full texts of funded grant submissions
  o Documentation of presentations
  o Other scholarly activities
2. Section III: Teaching. Everything listed above and
• Most recent course syllabus for all courses taught.
• Select materials to support exemplary teaching pedagogy.
3. Section III: Service
• Summary of service activities during the period of review organized as follows: Department of Kinesiology, the College of Health Professions, Towson University, profession and discipline-specific activities, and community-wide activities.
• Supporting documentation for select service activities.
xi. Tenure-Track Third Year Review
The department PTRM committee will conduct a review of tenure track faculty at the conclusion of the fall semester during their third year at Towson University. Tenure track faculty submit 3-inch summative binders using the same organization for promotion and tenure binders listed above. Portfolios are due to the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in January.
• The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate’s profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.
• Department PTRM committee evaluations of a candidate’s interim progress will become part of the faculty member’s file at the department level and shared with the dean.
• The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the department’s PTRM committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix III of ART. This outline is similar to the 3-inch summative binder previously listed above.
• Faculty submitting materials for a three-year review are expected to include a clear scholarship plan outlining their activities and progress directed towards meeting the criteria and standards for
promotion to Associate Professor (specific criteria found on page 16).

- The department PTRM committee will evaluate the materials and 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:
  1. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion recommendation; and
  2. must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

xii. 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 are needed.
3. **Not satisfactory** progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure recommendation.

xiii. Feedback should be both 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.

xiv. Copies of the chairperson’s or program director’s detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process.

f. Comprehensive Five-Year review (Post-tenure Review)

i. The comprehensive policies herein are in accordance with the principles established by the USM Board of Regents on 7/12/96 and shall not be construed to substitute for them.

ii. The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.

iii. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for the period of the preceding five (5) academic years.
iv. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the dean of the college.

v. Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed in Section 2. e. vi.

vi. A faculty member may appeal a negative recommendation at any point in the process, following procedures outlined in the Appeals Section (Section V) of this document.

vii. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member’s failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and the dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair, dean and provost.

viii. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernable improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction, or termination.

ix. Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.

x. Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their “home” department.

g. Reporting to candidates

i. After each deliberation and vote, the Department PTRM committee shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service.

- The committee’s written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.
- Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

ii. Annual Review letters will focus on the period of review. However, annual review letters for tenure-track faculty may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback on progress towards tenure to the candidate.

iii. Reappointment letters are brief and should refer readers to the Annual
Review letter for more information. The exception are letters needed to support a non-reappointment recommendation which require additional information to support the recommendation.

iv. If the Department Chair agrees with the PTRM Committee’s recommendation and letter for Annual Reviews and Reappointments, a final sentence is added to the PTRM Committee’s letter stating agreement with the recommendation. If the Department Chair disagrees with the PTRM Committee’s recommendation or the content of the letter, a separate letter is written by the Chair.

v. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters should focus on the period of review and support the PTRM’s recommendation.

vi. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and 5-year comprehensive review and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the required deadline.

vii. The recommendations of the Department PTRM and the Department Chair will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the designated deadlines. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the Department Chair or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

viii. The statement with recommendation and Evaluation Record shall be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio for submission to the Dean by the required deadlines.

h. Review of Department PTRM Document
   i. The department shall review its PTRM document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CHP PTRM committee, dean of the college and the university PTRM committee.
   j. Vote of Approval of this Document when New or Revised
      i. The department PTRM document, when new or revised, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of all fulltime faculty members eligible for either promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit.
      ii. Following approval, the document shall be forwarded to the college PTRM and University PTRM in accordance with the procedures and dates specified in ART III.

j. 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.

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

ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation s/he believes would present a more valid perspective on his/her performance.

iii. Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of CHP recommendations shall be copied to the CHP Dean and the CHP PTRM Committee.

iv. 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.

v. 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 included on the original appeal letter.

vi. Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.

b. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.

i. All procedure appeals must be made to the University PTRM committee.

ii. 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.

iii. The appeal will be reviewed by University PTRM 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.

iv. Recommendations made by the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The University PTRM chair will oversee this process.
c. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability.

3. Department of Kinesiology Standards and Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

In accordance with the TU ART policy:

- A faculty member shall fulfill his/her workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours, and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
- A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
- A CHP faculty member shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
- A KNES faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship.
- Collegiality and academic citizenship refer 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 that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.
- A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance.
- A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described herein.

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

a. Teaching
The KNES 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.
1. Teaching may take a variety of forms, including the following:
   a. Use of technology
   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. Classroom based instruction
   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

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

3. 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
   c. Guidance of students in the learning process within one’s class teaching responsibilities
   d. Advising groups in academic honor societies
   e. Serving on a graduate research committee

4. 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

5. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:
   a. Student evaluations,
   b. Peer evaluations (as appropriate)
   c. Self-evaluation
   d. Evaluation of student learning outcomes
   e. Judgment related to faculty performance by evaluating bodies

6. All courses taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be included in their evaluation of teaching. This includes all on-load as defined by the Department, on-line, classroom, clinical/fieldwork and hybrid courses taught during the academic year.

b. Scholarship
The KNES PTRM Committee values a range of scholarship activities. The committee acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship as defined by the Boyer Model.
1. 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.

2. The forms of scholarship include:
   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).

3. 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.

c. 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/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.

3. The following are types of Service-Related Activities:
   a. 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.
   b. 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.
   c. 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.
DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Faculty in the Department of Kinesiology are expected to meet the criteria and standards of the university and college 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.”

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 by 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, as indicated in the following table:
Table 1. Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and/or Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar-Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher-Scholar</th>
<th>Dedicated Teacher</th>
<th>Clinical Faculty</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing new scholarly initiatives that move beyond or expand from the research completed prior to hiring at Towson University.</td>
<td>Developing new scholarly initiatives that move beyond or expand from the research completed prior to hiring at Towson University.</td>
<td>Developing new scholarly initiatives that move beyond or expand from the research completed prior to hiring at Towson University.</td>
<td>Integration of current knowledge into teaching and/or clinical supervision experiences.</td>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
<td>Developing a focused area of scholarly expertise within the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly presentations at regional, national or international conferences.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly presentations at regional, national or international conferences.</td>
<td>A sustained record of scholarly presentations at regional, national or international conferences.</td>
<td>A minimum of 3 presentations at university, local, state, regional, national or international conferences. OR accomplish 1 item on the list A or B below.</td>
<td>A minimum of 2 presentations at university, local, state, regional, national or international conferences. OR accomplish 1 item on the list A or B below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline.</td>
<td>Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline.</td>
<td>Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline.</td>
<td>Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline.</td>
<td>Expanding knowledge by publishing 1 article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Addition, For promotion to Associate/Tenure: Accomplish at least 1 item from List A and 1 item from List B</td>
<td>In Addition, For promotion to Associate/Tenure: Accomplish at least 1 item from List A.</td>
<td>In Addition, For promotion to Associate/Tenure: Accomplish at least 1 item from List A or B</td>
<td>In Addition, For promotion to Clinical Associate: A record of scholarship and to include at least one peer-reviewed publication.</td>
<td>In Addition, For promotion to Senior Lecturer: no additional requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For promotion to Full: A sustained record of scholarship and to include at least 2 items from List A.

For Promotion to Full: A sustained record of scholarship and to include at least 2 items from List A.

For Promotion to Full: A sustained record of scholarship and to include at least 2 items from List A.

For promotion to Clinical Professor: A sustained record of scholarship to include at least two peer-reviewed publications and other scholarly work that is validated and disseminated to the professional community; A doctorate.

List A All items can be counted more than once.
1) Author/co-author of an article in a peer reviewed publication related to the discipline
2) Author/co-author/editor/co-editor of a peer reviewed book
3) Editor/co-editor of substantive document, such as a full issue of a peer-reviewed journal
4) Author/co-author of a substantial manuscript or a professional publication related to the discipline (book chapter, evidence-based literature review, education product, government report).
5) Funding awarded/sustained as Principle or Co-Investigator for external research grants or contracts.

List B All items can be counted only once
1) Funding awarded/sustained as Principle or Co-Investigator for internal research grants or contracts.
2) Funding awarded for Towson University Faculty Development Research Grant (only counts for Associate/Tenure decision).
3) Author/co-author of a publication of a non-peer reviewed article, such as trade publication, or in professional newsletter.
4) Principle or Co-Investigator for an external research grant or contract submitted but not funded.
5) Panelist or discussant at professional meeting.
6) Author of a technical report.
7) Conductor of a workshop.
8) Presentation at an international or national professional meeting
9) Presentation at a regional, state, or local professional meeting

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.

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Faculty in the Department of Kinesiology are expected to meet the criteria and standards of the University and College 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 reaching 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.”

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 of teaching and/or advising

Standards and Criteria on 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 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.

V. Met the criteria indicated in Table 1 above.

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.

Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty

I. Clinical assistant, and associate faculty are eligible for review for promotion and must present evidence to substantiate the promotion decision using criteria outlined in the College of Health Professions Clinical Faculty Promotion and Tenure Document and the TU Policy for Clinical Faculty.

II. The typical number of years in rank is five. The department committee and the chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion. Normally a three-year contract is recommended when there is a recommendation for promotion.

Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

I. Lecturer faculty are eligible for review for promotion and must present evidence to substantiate the promotion decision using criteria outlined in the College of Health Professions Promotion and Tenure Document, and Lecturer Document.

II. The typical number of years in rank is five. The department committee and the chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion.

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION 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.
b. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance meets standard and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.

c. Excellent (Base Merit Plus): Excellence in one out of three performance categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and satisfactory performance in two out of three of the performance categories.

II. Department of Kinesiology Standards and Criteria for Merit in Teaching for Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical Faculty, and Lecturers

a. No merit in teaching denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory teaching.

b. Satisfactory (base merit) teaching requires all of the following:
   1. Expertise in one’s field’s currency of knowledge base as reflected in course syllabi
   2. Appropriate and effective testing and evaluation of students as reflected in course syllabi
   3. Satisfactory performance on student evaluations for all courses: see Appendix B
   4. Satisfactory performance on peer evaluations (when available)

c. Excellent (base plus) merit teaching requires all of the following:
   1. Expertise in one’s field’s currency of knowledge base as reflected in course syllabi
   2. Appropriate and effective testing and evaluation of students as reflected in course syllabi
   3. Above average or outstanding performance on student evaluations for all courses: see Appendix B
   4. Above average or outstanding performance on peer evaluations (when available)

d. Procedure for evaluation of teaching by peers
   i. Two peer reviews of teaching are required annually for faculty being considered for reappointment, promotion, tenure, third-year review, comprehensive five-year review, and three-year clinical contract. The required form is to be found in Appendix A.

   ii. First year faculty receive three peer reviews of teaching. The first two occur in the fall semester before October 31. The third occurs in the spring semester. First year faculty should be observed by peers from their major when possible.

   iii. The department PTRM committee chair, in consultation with the Department Chairperson, will assign peer reviews.

   iv. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member. The timing of the review must allow for submission of the signed
observation form before the start of finals in the semester in which the review took place.
v. The period of observation must be at least 50 minutes.
vi. Following the observation, the faculty evaluator will meet with the observed faculty member to review a written summary and discuss the evaluation, within 2 weeks of the teaching observation.
vii. If they so choose, the observed faculty has up to 1 week after the discussion to provide written comments on the form.
viii. Following this discussion and the addition of any comments from the observed faculty, the peer evaluation form is signed by both the evaluator and observed faculty, with the original going to the department Chairperson and a copy to the evaluated faculty for inclusion in their annual AR materials.

e. Procedure for evaluation of teaching by students
i. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. The University distributes electronic evaluations to students and subsequently sends results to faculty after the semester under review has ended. From the documentation tabulated by the University, faculty must compose a summary table for their scores in each course related to eleven of the items in the students’ evaluation. A template and listing of these eleven items can be found in Appendix B.

ii. Tenured, tenure-track, clinical faculty, and lecturers shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.

iii. The evaluation portfolio must contain documentation of all courses taught during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year under evaluation. Faculty may choose to include evaluations from minimester and summer terms if desired.

III. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical Faculty, and Lecturers
a. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
b. Satisfactory (base merit) scholarship reflects the following:
   1. An ongoing commitment to familiarity with and integration of knowledge in one’s field as reflected in course syllabi
   2. Familiarity and integration as evidenced in such as:
      i. Contributions to program accreditation
      ii. Participation in continuing education
      iii. Contributions to curriculum projects
iv. Consultations as an expert
v. Active engagement in clinical practice where appropriate
c. Excellence (base plus) Merit for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty
Scholarship reflects a clearly defined and sustained focus on the scholarship of application, discovery, integration, and/or teaching. The following unweighted products may be presented as evidence of scholarship:

1. Peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences
2. Publications in peer-reviewed journals
3. Competitive internal and external grants attempted and received
4. Workshops conducted
5. Invited lectures
6. Panelist or discussant at professional meetings
7. Books
8. Book chapters
9. Monographs
10. Technical reports
11. Submission of manuscripts, research, proposals, programs, artifacts, and other products of scholarship
12. Reports of scholarship in progress
   The following may be presented in support of the quality of one’s scholarship:
   1. Citations of one’s work by other scholars
   2. Publications in peer-reviewed journals
   3. Peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences
   2. External evaluations and reviews of one’s work
   3. Invitations to present products of one’s scholarship
   4. Membership and participation on editorial review boards
   5. Receipt of competitive grants for research
   6. Awards and other recognition for the quality of one’s scholarship
d. Excellence (base plus) Merit for Clinical Faculty and Lecturers
   In addition to the work to meet satisfactory performance, the clinical faculty member or lecturer accomplished at least one of the following:
   1. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards an article or equivalent publication in a refereed or practice journal or a book.
   2. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency.
   3. Was a primary presenter at a local, regional, national, or international conference.
4. Provided evidence of validation of advanced or specialized practice skills beyond their clinical expertise certification.
5. Provided evidence of significant efforts toward dissemination of clinical expertise via consultation, participation in clinical research, scholarship of application or integration, or participation in a grant or grant application, workshops, development of case reports or comparable activities.

IV. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical Faculty, and lecturers.
   a. Needs Improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
   b. Satisfactory (base merit) service requires the following:
      1. Sustained membership in service entities at one level (College, University, Community)
      2. Sustained membership in professional organization(s) appropriate to one’s field
   c. Excellent (base plus merit) service requires meeting standards for service both within the University and in service to one’s profession as follows:
      1. Service within the University must fulfill at least two of the following:
         i. Membership on University-appointed or elected committees or task forces [college level committee for clinical faculty, and lecturers.]
         ii. Leadership positions (officer, chair, director, or coordinator) of Department, College or University committees
         iii. Contributions to addressing important issues
         iv. Development of course and/or program proposals
      2. Service that is professionally-related must fulfill at least two of the following:
         i. Contributions to working committees (other than through a leadership position)
         ii. Appointed or elected leadership position(s)
         iii. Contributions to licensure or accreditations
         iv. Advocacy work in important issues
         v. Peer reviewer of manuscripts for journal
         vi. Editor (at any level) of peer review journal
         viii. Peer reviewer of abstracts for annual conference/scientific meeting
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.

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 chairperson 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 of Appendix 3 of the ART policy.

Third Friday in August (KNES Department Deadline)
Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1. KNES PTRM Committee Deliberations can begin.

The First Friday in September
Department chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the department tenure and/or promotion committee.

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).

D. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The 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.

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 chairperson.
B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.
C. Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.

The Fourth Friday in October
A. 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.
B. The department chairperson 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 chairperson’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 chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTRM chairperson 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 Second Friday in December
First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

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 chairperson.
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 PTRM committee and chairperson 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 chairperson.
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.

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 chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.

First Friday in April
The department shall review its PTRM document every three (3) years and submit evidence of such review to the dean of the college and the university PTRM committee.

Second Friday in April
Election of chairs of the department PTRM committee will be conducted.

Third Friday in April
Appointment of members of the department PTRM committee.
Appendix A
Department of Kinesiology Peer Observation Form

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY
PEER OBSERVATION REPORT FORM

Date: _____________________________  Class: _____________________________

Observer (type): ___________________  Observer Signature: ___________________

Faculty Observed (type): ______________  Faculty Signature: ___________________

**FACULTY OBSERVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION OF PRESENTATION</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION SKILLS (VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE USE OF METHODS</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS (MEETING THEIR NEEDS; RAPPORT, ETC)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### OVERALL SUMMARY

| TOTAL POINTS (sum of all points) | | | | |
| AVERAGE POINTS (mean of all points) | | | | |

### RATING LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5-Above</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00-4.49</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.99</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99-Below</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EVALUATEE COMMENTS
Appendix B
Student Online Course Evaluation for Merit Consideration

1. The following eleven items (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17) are those used for this calculation.

Student Self-Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Course learning objectives were clearly described in the syllabus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assignments/tests reflected the primary content of this course as set out in the course learning objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The course was clearly organized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Course learning objectives were met</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I understood the requirements for course grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson Mission Driven Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Ended Questions

22. What do you like about this course?
23. What could be improved about this course?
24. Would you recommend this class to others? Why or why not?
Quantitative Student Evaluation Spreadsheet by Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Course Learning Objectives Clearly Described in Syllabus</td>
<td>Assignment Informed the Course Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Course was Clearly Organized</td>
<td>Course Learning Objectives were Met</td>
<td>Learning Requirements for Course were Clear</td>
<td>Instructor Explained Concepts Clearly</td>
<td>Instructor Assessed Grades According to Set Criteria</td>
<td>Instructor Provided Feedback on Performance</td>
<td>Instructor Demonstrated Expertise and Subject Matter</td>
<td>Instructor Encouraged Me to Do My Best</td>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>Number of Students Evaluated</td>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Student Evaluation Summary Spreadsheet for all Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>KNES XXX</td>
<td>KNES XXX</td>
<td>KNES XXX</td>
<td>KNES XXX</td>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>Number of Students Evaluated</td>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix C: KNES Department Promotion and Tenure Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>University/Dept. Policy Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload Agreements due to Chair</td>
<td>1st Friday in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Documents due to Chair</td>
<td>3rd Friday in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Agreement due to Dean</td>
<td>2nd Friday in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to update Portfolios (Binders) and Workload Agreements</td>
<td>3rd Friday in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNES PTRM Committee Deliberations Can Begin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teaching Evaluation Schedule Distributed</td>
<td>September 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTF signed by new faculty</td>
<td>3rd Friday in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Request for Promotion or Tenure Decision</td>
<td>3rd Friday in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports for reappointment, tenure, promotion, annual review, merit signed faculty</td>
<td>2nd Friday in October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty appeal deadline</td>
<td>October 31st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTRM materials and reports forwarded to the Dean</td>
<td>2nd Friday in November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty course evaluations</td>
<td>End of Each Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of new/revised Department PTRM document due to CHP PTRM Committee</td>
<td>First Friday in December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio documents/binders due from new and 3rd-year faculty</td>
<td>Second Friday in December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNES PTR Committee Meeting (New faculty mid-year review)</td>
<td>TBD by Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports for new faculty signed by faculty member</td>
<td>3rd Friday in January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Letter Sent to New Faculty</td>
<td>March 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Letter Sent to All Other Faculty</td>
<td>3rd Friday in March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty appeal to Provost Decisions</td>
<td>10 Business days after decision letter issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNES Department Faculty review PTRM document every 3 years and submit evidence of a review to the dean of the college and the UPTRM</td>
<td>1st Friday in April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNES PTRM committee chairperson elected</td>
<td>2nd Friday in April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNES PTRM committee formed (including Clinical Faculty and Lecturers)</td>
<td>3rd Friday in April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>