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Towson University Department of Nursing Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit

I. EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY

A. Board of Regents

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

B. University

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

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

1. Expectations for faculty in the Department of Nursing are consistent with those of the University. Additionally, since professional nursing is a practice as well as an intellectual discipline, expectations include clinical competence and professional/clinical activities.

2. Faculty members will be competent contributors to the Department, College of Health Professions and University within the framework of their expertise and interests and the needs of the department, college and university.

3. Faculty members with 8 course unit teaching loads will be competent in teaching, scholarship and service. (See Appendices)

4. Faculty members with 6 or 7 unit teaching loads will have expectations and evaluation congruent with their work load agreement. (See Appendices)

5. Faculty members with teaching loads less than those noted above (Contract, sabbatical, or administrative assignment) will have expectations and evaluation congruent with their work load agreement. (See Appendices)

6. The Department’s Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit (PTRM) Committee’s specific standards and expectations, are included for Tenure-Tenure Track Faculty/Appendix B (Department of Nursing Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty); & Appendix C (Department of Nursing Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for Clinical Faculty). The Department of Nursing adheres to the standards, expectations, and procedures for the evaluation of lecturers as outlined in the College of Health Professions; Guidelines for the Employment of Lecturers and the Towson University Policy on the Employment of Lecturers.

7. New faculty shall receive a Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty/Clinical Faculty that includes the following items:
   - Board of Regents’ and Towson University’s criteria for promotion
   - Standards and Expectations of the University, College, and Department
   - Expectations unique to the position.
II. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. In accordance with University policy, the responsibility for presenting the annual review materials, the five-year comprehensive review, and/or the case for reappointment, promotion, or tenure rests with the faculty member. Each faculty member, with the help of the Department Chairperson or designated mentor, is expected to prepare a portfolio that addresses the professorial role expectations of faculty in the university, the college and the department. The portfolio is due the Department of Nursing PTRM Committee by the 3rd Friday in June.

B. Type of Review determines portfolio material and processes

1. Annual review of all faculty: Annual review materials must include the following documents:
   - Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) Part I or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR) Part I
   - Annual Report Part II (Agreements on Faculty Workload Expectations) (current year (signed) and projected year)
   - Current Professional Curriculum Vitae
   - Syllabi for courses taught during the year under review
   - Evaluation of teaching and advising including student evaluations, qualitative evaluations, and grade distributions
   - Documentation of scholarship and service

2. Annual review of non-tenured/tenure track faculty: Tenure track faculty shall add the following items to those listed in II.B.1.
   - Peer evaluations of theoretical and clinical teaching
   - Departmental recommendation letter, which must include a written report on the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

3. Annual review of clinical faculty: Clinical faculty shall add the following items: Peer evaluations of theoretical and clinical teaching.

4. Full review for candidates for tenure and/or promotion: A critical part of the portfolio shall be a narrative statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met and integrated the teaching, scholarship and service expectations of all faculty. All materials listed above in II.B.1 and II.B.2 from the candidate’s date of hire or last promotion must also be included. Solicited external reviews may be included in the evaluation portfolio by individual faculty request or by request of the PT/RM Committee.

5. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty: Once every five years, the annual review shall be replaced by a comprehensive five-year
review. See *Five Year Review, Towson University (Faculty Handbook)* for details.

6. **Merit Review:** Merit review shall be concurrent with annual review. The review shall follow Department of Nursing policies, standards, and procedures. The merit appeal process shall follow the same protocol as the promotion and tenure process.

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

A. The faculty candidate shall apply for consideration according to department procedures and timetable. The faculty candidate must notify the Department Chair in writing of his or her intention to apply for promotion by the third Friday in September of the preceding year. By the fourth Friday in September of the academic year preceding the academic year in which a faculty member is to undergo tenure or promotion, the Department Chair shall notify all members of the Department, the Dean, and the Provost of the faculty member’s intentions.

The faculty candidate shall submit a summative portfolio in a one inch binder and a supplemental binder with supporting materials that lend specificity to the candidate’s credentials. [See College documents for details.]

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

1. Eligible members of the Committee are determined according to the Department’s policies and procedures.

2. The Committee shall prepare a concisely written statement supportive of the recommended decision that acknowledges both the strengths and areas for continued professional growth of the faculty candidate consistent with the department documentation by the second Friday in October.

3. The Department Academic Chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation that either agrees or disagrees with the Committee’s recommendation by the fourth Friday in October. (The Department Academic Chairperson is a member of the Committee.)

4. The recommended decision shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty candidate, inclusive of any Department Academic Chair’s statement.
and a record of the vote count, and shall be forwarded to the Dean’s office with the candidate’s dossier no later than the fourth Friday in October. A negative decision should be delivered in person by the Department Academic Chairperson (or designee) or sent by certified mail to the candidate’s last known address.

5. The faculty candidate’s lengthier supportive file shall be forwarded to the Dean’s office.

6. The faculty member may submit a substantive written appeal of the Department level PTRM Committee’s recommendation to the chairperson of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter should be sent to the Dean’s office by certified mail or delivered in person within 21 calendar days of having been notified of the recommendation. The appeal should be accompanied by supportive material.

7. Procedures established by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and University ART shall be followed.

IV. METHODS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

A. Teaching and Advising

1. Like the University, the Department demands excellence in teaching. Faculty must be able to teach nursing content within the framework of the Philosophy and Program Outcomes of the Department of Nursing: apply nursing theory to learning situations in a variety of settings, demonstrate skill in the use of contemporary educational methodologies and create an environment conducive to learning. There must be evidence of competence in classroom and clinical teaching in an area of clinical preparation, as well as a willingness to assume responsibility for teaching in both classroom and clinical settings. Concomitant with these requirements is the ability to develop and maintain professional relationships with persons in academia, the profession, and the health care system. These relationships link the faculty and the Department to organizations and populations, which are essential to the attainment of the Department’s program objectives. (See Appendices A & B.)

2. The scholarship of teaching takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology or classroom-based or clinically-based research to improve teaching in classroom and/or clinical settings. Scholarship of teaching may include faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, or the development of new
courses and programs, especially those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work or K-16 partnerships.

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

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

a. Evaluation of Teaching by Students

Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. Such an evaluation must be recognized for what it is; namely, one kind of evaluation, of a generalized nature, and to be considered only in concert with all other measures of teaching effectiveness. The Department of Nursing forms are the following:

- Towson University Student Online Course Evaluations: Course and Instructor Subsections
- Student Evaluation of Clinical Instructor
- Student Evaluation of Preceptor
- Student Evaluation of Clinical Experience

(See Appendix C, Department of Nursing Evaluation Tools).

Student evaluations must be conducted in such a manner to assure confidentiality of the student. Student evaluations are either distributed and collected through the University’s online evaluation system or are distributed to students during the meeting of the last class of the semester (i.e. seminar, clinical, or practicum courses). When student evaluations are distributed in class, faculty should allow students sufficient time for reflective thinking and evaluation. One student should be designated to collect completed forms and submit them to a Department of Nursing Administrative Assistant. The faculty member should not remain in the classroom while students are completing the evaluation forms.

All faculty shall be evaluated by students for classroom and/or clinical every semester, as appropriate.
b. Evaluation of Teaching by Peers

Classroom/clinical visits and evaluation of online courses are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the person is being considered for promotion or for reappointment, tenure, or third year review. Peer review of teaching is also required for the comprehensive five-year review.

A minimum of two peer review observations shall be conducted per review period for tenure track and tenured faculty:

- Tenure-track – two reviews per year of reappointment
- Tenured faculty – two reviews conducted during five-year review period

A minimum of one peer review observation will be conducted annually for clinical faculty:

- Clinical faculty – one review per year of reappointment

The criteria to be used for observing and reporting classroom or clinical peer review observations are identified in the *Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching* (see Appendix C).

The *Faculty Evaluation of Teaching* (theory or clinical) form (see Appendix C) should be used to document peer evaluations. A copy of the completed evaluation should be given to the faculty member within two weeks of the observation and a copy forwarded to the Academic Chairperson for placement in the faculty member's file.

c. Evaluation of Advising

Student evaluations of advising are required annually. The advisor will distribute the forms to assigned Pre-Nursing and Nursing advisees. All forms will be returned to the advisor for review. (See Appendix C, *Department of Nursing Advising Evaluation Tool*.)

d. Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation of teaching and/or advising effectiveness shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching and or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and or
peer/chairperson evaluations. The *Faculty Evaluation of Teaching* (classroom or clinical) form may be used for this purpose.

B. Scholarship

1. The Department abides by the following definitions of scholarship:

   From the University ART:
   
   *Scholarship* is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the *scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration and/or Teaching.* Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field as affirmed by its community of scholars.

   **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.

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

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

   **Scholarship of Teaching** – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning.

From the College of Health Professions;

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

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.

2. Collaboration within the Department, College, and University is encouraged. Mentoring of junior faculty is valued. The Department’s goal is to foster collegial exchange while furthering the individual’s development within the larger missions of the discipline of nursing, department, college and university.

3. The standards and expectations for scholarship of the department are identified in Appendices A & B.

C. Service

1. Service is broadly defined to include participation in the governing and administrative activities of the department, college, or university. It also may include service to the discipline of nursing and the profession. Civic engagement or service to the larger community outside of the university may be included if it draws upon the discipline or interdisciplinary specialty or furthers the university mission.

2. The standards and expectations for service in the Department are identified in Appendices A & B.

V. MERIT

The Board of Regents’ regulations require that merit salary increases that may be awarded shall use a merit system that results in differential increments. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and service. All tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty will be evaluated each year at the department level for merit according to established standards.

A. The performance standards for evaluation of merit include:

1. Teaching: Unsatisfactory, satisfactory and excellent performance in teaching is evaluated through student clinical and course evaluations and advising evaluations. Quantitative student evaluation ratings, students’ qualitative comments and faculty responses, peer reviews, and advising evaluations are included in this review.
2. Scholarship: Unsatisfactory, satisfactory and excellent performance in scholarship is evaluated through application of the Boyer model.

3. Service: Unsatisfactory, satisfactory and excellent performance in service is evaluated through evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service.

Merit will be based on the following criteria for tenured/tenure-track and clinical faculty. Where appropriate, criteria specific to tenure/tenure-track or clinical faculty are identified:

To qualify for Departmental merit, a faculty member shall demonstrate a professionally responsible level of achievement in the three areas which measure faculty performance.

The following are the Department's definitions for the above categories of merit.

**Needs Improvement** - Faculty whose performance fail to meet Department standards in accordance with Appendices A & B.

**Satisfactory** -- Faculty whose work demonstrates achievement in meeting the basic standards and expectations for all three dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with Appendices A & B.

**Excellent** -- Faculty whose work is satisfactory and who also excels in one or more of the three dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with Appendices A & B.

The following evidence will be used to support merit decisions:

**Needs Improvement** -

*Teaching:*

1. Student evaluation: Quantitative: overall mean of instructor ratings = 2.99 and below; Qualitative: a preponderance of student comments are negative.

2. Peer evaluation: Major concerns indicated in comments and need for follow-up conference and recommendation for re-evaluation.

3. Evidence of ineffective advising:
   
a. consistent pattern of negative advising evaluations (given a satisfactory “N”)


b. pattern of negative correspondence from students, advisees, alumni colleagues, administrators

c. advising records, schedules, files reflect a pattern of inaccurate or ineffective advising

**Scholarship:**

1. inability to articulate a clear scholarship plan
2. lack of progression in implementation of the scholarship plan

**Service:**

1. Lack of membership on required number of Department committees as referenced in Appendices A & B
2. Recognition by colleagues/administrators of sustained pattern of lateness, absence, or lack of involvement on committees or in department service activities
3. Lack of collegiality and civility

**Satisfactory** (Base Merit) –

**Teaching:** The faculty member demonstrates effective teaching/advising practices consistent with the percentage of effort for teaching documented in the faculty member’s workload agreement. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

1. Student evaluation overall mean average 3.0 to 3.99. Preponderance of qualitative student feedback reflects teaching effectiveness. (Required)
2. Incorporates instructor evaluation data from all courses to improve teaching methodology
3. Peer evaluations: satisfactory. Preponderance of qualitative peer feedback reflects teaching effectiveness. (Required if a peer evaluation is required for the academic year under review)
4. Additional evidence of effective teaching (must demonstrate at least one):
   a. Incorporates course evaluation data to improve teaching methodology;
   b. Course content and teaching strategies are supportive of department mission;
   c. Student products/projects reflect student learning outcomes
5. Evidence of effective advising (must demonstrate at least one):
   a. Advising evaluations at least 3.0 on a 5.0 scale (given a satisfactory “N”)

   b. Correspondence from students, alumni, colleagues, administrator reflect
      satisfactory advising

   c. Advising records, schedules, files demonstrate accurate and sound advising
      practices

Scholarship: The faculty member meets the basic standards and expectations for scholarship as
established by the Department of Nursing and articulated in the Annual Report Part II. These
expectations are consistent with the percentage of effort for scholarship documented in the
faculty member’s workload agreement. The faculty member engages in a clearly focused
scholarship plan. Supporting evidence includes:

   1. Clearly articulated description of one’s scholarship plan (For clinical faculty, the
      focused area of scholarship expertise is in the clinical discipline) (Required)

   2. Selected products of one’s scholarly activity (Required)

   3. Reports of scholarly activity in progress (Required)

   4. Participation in continuing education/professional development activities (Required)

   5. External evaluation and review of one’s work (Recommended)

   6. Professional certification (Recommended)

Service: The faculty member meets the basic standards and expectations as set forth by the
Department and consistent with the percentage of effort for service documented in the faculty
member’s workload agreement. The faculty member is involved in the institution’s governance
structure at the Department, College or University level and makes contributions to the
community or profession based on their areas of expertise. Supporting evidence includes:

   1. Membership on at least one Department level committee (Required)

   2. Active committee membership on at least one College or University committee
      (Recommended)

   3. Active participation in special programs or civic engagement initiatives
      (Recommended)

   4. Active participation in the planning of relevant academic or professional development
      activities (Recommended)

   5. Membership in local, state, or national professional associations (Recommended)
Excellent (Base Plus Merit) –

Teaching: The faculty member demonstrates excellence in teaching and advising consistent with the percentage of effort for teaching identified in the workload agreement. Evidence of excellence in teaching/advising includes:

Teaching/Advising:
1. Student evaluations: overall mean average 4.0 to 5.0 Preponderance of qualitative student feedback reflects teaching excellence. (Required)

2. Peer evaluations: excellent. Preponderance of qualitative peer feedback reflects teaching excellence. (Required if a peer evaluation is required during the academic year under review)

3. Additional evidence of effective teaching (must demonstrate at least one):
   a. teaching methods, materials, strategies, published or presented or other forms of external review
   b. receipt of University curriculum and instructional development grants
   c. teaching awards and nominations
   d. unsolicited feedback received from students, alumni, or other faculty attesting to teaching excellence
   e. demonstrated leadership in course or program development
   f. samples of innovative work (e.g., teaching strategies reflect critical thinking use of technologies, balance between use of standard and more creative methods)

4. Evidence of excellence in advising (must demonstrate at least one):
   a. advising evaluations overall mean average 4.0 on a 5.0 scale (given a satisfactory “N”)
   b. positive correspondence from students, alumni, colleagues, administrators attesting to advising excellence
   c. advising records, schedules, files demonstrating quality of advising

Scholarship: The faculty member demonstrates currency in the knowledge base in their field and applies that knowledge to teaching, service, or other professional activities. The faculty member implements and sustains a clearly focused scholarship plan consistent with the percentage of effort for scholarship identified in the workload agreement. Supporting evidence includes:
1. Clearly developed scholarship plan (For clinical faculty the focused area of scholarship expertise is in the clinical discipline). (Required)

2. Dissemination and external validation of scholarship through external reviews, peer review, publication, grants, presentations, development of policies/procedures which are research or evidence based. (Required)

3. Tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities and products of one’s scholarship (Required)

4. External invitations to review the scholarship of others (Recommended)

5. Awards or other professional recognition for quality of one’s scholarship (Recommended).

For clinical faculty, evidence of scholarly activity/professional development may include:

1. Evidence of contribution towards a manuscript in a refereed or practice based publication.

2. Evidence of contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency.

3. Evidence of validation of advanced or specialized practice skills, such as appropriate and related certification or credentialing.

4. Evidence of significant efforts toward dissemination of clinical expertise via consultation, participation in clinical research, submission of technical or accreditation reports, scholarship of application or integration, or participation in a grant, grant application, or workshop/professional development activity.

Service: The faculty member assumes leadership in service activities or makes significant service contributions to the institution or community consistent with the percentage of effort for service in the workload agreement. Supporting evidence includes (at least 2 of the criteria below are required to meet the criteria for excellence in service):

1. Assumes a leadership role on a committee at the Department, College, or University level

2. Active involvement on one or more College/University level committees;

3. Assumes an advocacy role by volunteering to take on difficult or essential tasks that facilitate problem resolution and promote functioning of the department, college, or university

4. Board member or leadership position in professional or community organization or association
5. Holds a key position on a Department/College/University level committee or task force

6. Serves as a consultant to a community organization

7. Recognition by others of the quality and impact of one’s service activities.

8. Leadership in civic engagement initiatives

9. Leadership as a program director or course coordinator

B. Procedures

Faculty will be recommended for Departmental Merit by the PTRM Committee when the following criteria are satisfied:

1. The faculty has completed and submitted to the Department Chair or his or her designee by the third Friday in June the University PTRM required Annual Report (AR) forms with attached syllabus as needed and Summary of Student Evaluation form.

2. The faculty member has demonstrated a professionally responsible level of achievement in the three areas which measure faculty performance: teaching, scholarship and service to the University and community.

3. Each PTRM Committee member, after reviewing the individual faculty's portfolio, in accordance with general standards and expectations of the Department and the University, will make a decision regarding Department merit. Each committee member will rate three areas - teaching, scholarship, service. Rank is determined by the collective ratings of the Committee members.

4. Recommendations for departmental merit for individual faculty shall include written justification for the Committee's action. Recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member. A negative decision shall be delivered in person by the Department Chair or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

5. The PTRM Committee Chairperson will complete the Department Summary Recommendation (DSR) form for all persons being considered.

6. Portfolios are returned to the PTRM Committee Chairperson who obtains the signature of the faculty member on her/his DSR form (indicating only that she/he has read it). The DSR form, along with other materials in the faculty member’s portfolio, are forwarded to the Dean’s office by the second Friday in November.
7. The Department Chair shall meet with each faculty member to discuss the AR, the student and peer evaluations of teaching and advising, the Department PTRM merit recommendation, and the annual faculty evaluation in general.

8. Specified deadlines on the University's PTRM calendar shall be observed for completion of the merit process (see University Faculty Handbook).

VI. THIRD YEAR REVIEW

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVIEW OF FACULTY PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE AND PROMOTION DURING THE THIRD YEAR (“Third Year Review”)

A. Purpose of Review. The department recognizes that each faculty member offers a unique combination of education, skills, interests, experiences and career aspirations. Consequently, while the standards for performance will be consistent among faculty, the areas in which each faculty member is evaluated and the weight assigned to each of those areas will differ among faculty, consistent with the annual workload agreements as agreed to by faculty, chair and dean.

At the conclusion of the Fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, the department PTRM Committee shall conduct a “Third Year Review” of tenure-track candidates. The purpose of the review is to serve as an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member.

The review will be done in concert with the Criteria for Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review as described in the Towson University ART. As noted below, 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.

B. Dimensions of Review. Candidates during their third year of service will be evaluated on three primary dimensions: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. Balance among dimensions is to be achieved through the workload as developed by the faculty member, chair and dean. In addition, a faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship as demonstrated by humane, ethical and professional behavior.

Teaching (in all its components including advising and mentoring): Student learning is at the core of Towson’s mission and the primary commitment of the faculty of the department. The teaching dimension of performance includes: Advising assigned and unassigned students from the department’s major fields of study, counseling students enrolled in the faculty member’s courses, classroom or online instruction, mentoring graduate and undergraduate research, preparation and keeping current in the subject areas being taught, and evaluation of student performance. Teaching may also include supervision of student internships and directed or independent studies. It is acknowledged
that approaches and outcomes may differ among disciplines and it is for the discipline and department to determine standards within the framework of the faculty handbook. While faculty play a critical role in student learning, this policy re-affirms the primary responsibility of the student for the student’s own learning outcomes and career preparation.

Scholarship: Scholarship involves the investigation of the significance and meaning of knowledge, undertaken through critical analysis and interpretation. Scholarship may be applied, where knowledge is applied to real world problems to gain an understanding of how the knowledge can be used to help individuals and institutions resolve such problems. Scholarship may also be that of discovery, where new knowledge is developed through rigorous and disciplined investigative efforts. Scholarship may also be considered that of original creative work.

Scholarship typically includes both a process of peer review and some form of dissemination (or “publication”) of the work as determined by the relevant academic discipline.

The following are possible ways in which scholarship can be pursued and included as part of the annual workload agreement: presentations made at practitioner conferences and events; presentations made at scholarly conferences, with or without proceedings publication; publication of a refereed article, case, monograph, book chapter or book; publication of textbook supplements or other course materials; award of a research grant or fellowship; creation of licensed computer software; reviews of books, software, etc. in a refereed scholarly journal; awards from the department, college, university or professional association for scholarly activity; and others. Many fields demonstrate "publication" through creative production rather than through traditional written documents.” For example "appropriate kinds of scholarship/creative activity” may include: productions, juried exhibitions, distribution, management (of media stations or labs), internet publication, and multi-media performance as well as film, video and digital media productions. Additionally, the department may determine that a grant proposal (and the successful attainment of a grant) may be either scholarship or service depending upon its assessment of the purpose and quality of the grant.

Service: Faculty are expected to contribute their professional expertise to the department, college, university and professional associations. They are encouraged, but not required, to contribute to their communities as well. It is desirable that faculty service work, both at Towson and in professional associations, begins with membership and active participation on committees and eventually progress to leadership roles. Assessment will consider the level and extent of participation and contribution to service endeavors (rather than mere membership) and the collegiality displayed in treating others in a respectful manner. In presenting their service for review, faculty members should prepare a narrative, which explains the scope and depth of their contributions and may also solicit letters of support, or references, from those under whom the service was engaged.
C. Procedure. At the conclusion of the Fall semester during a candidate’s third year at Towson University, tenure track faculty should prepare an interim portfolio of activities for evaluation by the department’s PTRM committee. The intention of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure by advising and mentoring the faculty member. This includes providing:

1. assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate’s profile are identified;
2. encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary.

The faculty member should submit materials for the previous two and one-half years as if the faculty member were applying for tenure and/or promotion. All documentation is due to the Department Chair or his or her designee by the third Friday in January. The department PTRM Committee will evaluate the materials and indicate to the faculty member, in writing:

1. whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
2. what suggestions the PTRM committee has for a positive decision at the end of the tenure track period.

This written report will become part of the faculty member’s file at the department level, shared with the dean, and will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the provost. Again, the purpose of the review is to serve as an advisory and mentoring function for the faculty member. The faculty member undergoing third year review will meet with the Department Chair and the PTRM Committee Chair to discuss the report by the third Friday in March.

D. Portfolio. For purposes of the Third Year Review, the following materials (as set out in the Faculty Handbook, Annual Review) will be needed:

1. A critical part of the candidate’s portfolio shall be a narrative statement in which the candidate describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations over the review period. A scholarship plan will be included.
2. The portfolio from the previous two full years of service at Towson University each of which must include the following documents:
   a. AR (Annual Report) or CAR (Chairperson’s Annual Report) form including workload statement signed by faculty, chair and dean.
   b. Curriculum vitae
   c. Syllabi of courses taught in the year being reviewed
   d. Summary of student evaluations of teaching and advising
   e. Peer evaluations
   f. Evidence of scholarship
   g. Evidence of service.
   h. AR part II from the previous academic year for continuing faculty, for each year.
   i. Material from the Fall semester immediately preceding the third-year review, including at least peer and student teaching evaluations and advising evaluations, together with any other material that may be included in a complete annual report.
E. Standards. The Department PTRM committee will assess the Third Year Review candidate and a clear statement of progress toward tenure must be included. New faculty must develop excellence in teaching (including advising and mentoring) and a plan for, and evidence of, scholarly productivity. Service will be evaluated according to department standards. As noted under Dimensions of Review (above) a faculty member also shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship as demonstrated by humane, ethical and professional behavior. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

1. **Superior** progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching (in all its components including advising), excellence in scholarship and meeting department standards in service. Promotion and/or tenure is likely to be recommended.

2. **Satisfactory** progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This essentially means that the department has determined that progress towards promotion and tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be 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.

F. Accelerated Track Review. In the circumstance where a faculty has been hired on an accelerated tenure-track timetable the agreement between faculty and dean or provost shall supersede the third-year review. In those instances, the regular Annual Review by the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

VII. COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW (POST TENURE REVIEW)

All tenured faculty in the Department of Nursing shall participate in a comprehensive review at least once every five years to assess the faculty member’s performance over time and to provide an opportunity to establish a professional plan to serve as a basis for the next comprehensive review. The Department will follow the procedure for instituting a comprehensive review of all tenured faculty as outlined in the University Faculty Handbook (see Five-Year Review). The comprehensive review will use the same sources and methods as the annual merit review of faculty, except that the comprehensive review shall examine a period of up to five years. A reflective comprehensive summary, including goals for the next five years, consisting of no more than five typed pages shall be written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five years of his or her work. This summary, along with supporting materials, will be submitted to the PTRM Committee, which also serves as the Comprehensive Review Committee. Faculty who receive a negative comprehensive review will be required to create an appropriate plan for professional development, which must be completed by the third Friday in June.
of the academic year in which the review occurred. The professional development plan must be approved in writing by the Department Chairperson, the Dean of the College and the Provost. The progress of faculty in meeting the goals of the professional development plan shall be evaluated as part of the annual review process.

VIII. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

A. The Department of Nursing PTRM Committee shall be composed of the Department Academic Chairperson and a minimum of three tenured faculty members at the Associate or Professor rank, one tenure-track faculty member at the Assistant or Associate Professor rank who has successfully completed the third-year review, and one Clinical faculty at the Associate or Professor rank.

1. A quorum shall be a simple majority of the voting members.

2. The committee shall elect a chairperson by simple majority vote.

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). The additional tenured faculty member shall be selected from a list of at least three faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review. The faculty member under review shall submit a list of recommended additional faculty members on or before the third Friday in June. The Department Chair and the Dean will review the list (from the appropriate college) and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The College Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee will select the additional faculty members to be added to the committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.

B. Members are elected by tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty and shall serve a three-year term, arranged so that approximately 1/3 of the members are elected each year. If a vacancy in the committee's membership should occur, nominations shall be put forth at the next scheduled regular Faculty Organization meeting to fill the vacancy. Committee members are elected at the Annual Meeting of the Department of Nursing Faculty Organization in May.

C. Voting

1. The Academic Chairperson shall not be a voting member of the PTRM Committee.
2. A committee member must be present for all deliberations in order to vote and must be present to vote.

3. In the event of a tie vote, the deliberations will continue and the vote retaken. If the second vote remains a tie, the decision is considered negative.

4. Committee members on sabbatical may vote on issues providing they have reviewed the materials, are present for all deliberations, and are in attendance at the meeting in which the vote is taken.

5. All votes regarding promotion, tenure, reappointment, merit or comprehensive review taken by any committee and/or the Department shall be by secret ballot signed with the TU ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Dean and then to the Provost to be preserved with the tenure and promotion files until three years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the University. The PTRM Committee Chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the Committee’s recommendation to the next level of review.

6. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, such as an impermissible conflict of interest.

7. Clinical and tenure track PTRM committee members are not eligible to vote on tenure or promotion of tenure track or tenured faculty but may vote on promotion, reappointment and merit of clinical faculty. Only tenured faculty members on the Committee may vote for promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor.

8. Tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and decide by majority vote to recommend:
   a. tenure, or
   b. that tenure not be granted

D. Duties

1. Administer the system of faculty evaluation and establish the calendar, standards, and guidelines for the Department. Any calendar and/or standards shall be consistent with University and College guidelines and Department of Nursing Bylaws.
2. Define standards and specific criteria for nursing faculty for use in promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit consideration.

3. Reappoint/approve faculty who will serve as mentors for non-tenured faculty and those seeking promotion with Department of Nursing Chair approval.

4. Review, revise and maintain all documents pertaining to promotion, tenure/reappointment and merit every three years in accordance with University guidelines.

5. Faculty members to vote on PTRM document changes before the second Friday in February.

E. Procedures

1. Distribute documents to Department of Nursing faculty.

2. Receive for review all faculty promotion, tenure/reappointment and merit documents in accordance with the University promotion and tenure calendar.

3. Deliberate to make recommendations for all faculty promotions, tenure/reappointment and merit, including third-year review and five-year comprehensive review. The Committee will not review any portfolio that is not complete.

4. For each faculty action, the Committee will provide supporting data and rationale.

5. Recommend policy changes to the Department of Nursing Faculty Organization.

6. Submit an annual report to the Department of Nursing Faculty Organization by May of each year.

F. Role of the Academic Chairperson

1. The Academic Chairperson is not a voting member of the Department’s PTRM Committee. Normally the Academic Chairperson does not serve as chairperson of this committee. The Chairperson may not sit in on his or her own promotion or merit deliberations.
2. Consistent with the leadership, communication, governance and management roles, as specified in *The Role & Responsibilities of Academic Chairpersons at Towson University*, the Academic Chairperson shall be involved in the development and approval of the annual workload expectations of all faculty in the Department. The Academic Chairperson will facilitate these processes within the framework of the *Towson University Policy Statement on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty* and the *Towson University Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities* for new and continuing faculty.

3. Each year the Academic Chairperson shall review and discuss with each individual faculty member their *Annual Report* which describes the correlation between expectations and achievement.

4. The Academic Chairperson may provide the Department PTRM Committee with relevant information about the individual faculty member’s overall performance as a member of the department.

G. Role and responsibilities of the PTRM Committee Chairperson

1. To assign appropriate faculty members to visit tenured, non-tenured and non-tenure-track faculty classes and clinical learning experiences for the purpose of evaluation of teaching. This assignment shall be communicated to faculty within the first month of the academic year.

2. To collect the portfolio from faculty pertaining to promotion, tenure/reappointment, comprehensive review and merit.

3. To conduct Committee meetings and record all recommendations made by the Committee.

4. To complete the DSR form for each person and forward completed forms to the Academic Chair for the Academic Chairperson’s signature.

5. To obtain or assign a designee to obtain the signature of individual faculty members for the DSR form.

6. The Committee Chairperson, or designee, shall prepare a departmental summary letter which includes a written report on progress toward tenure for non-tenured tenure-track candidates.

7. The Committee Chairperson, or designee, shall prepare a department summary letter which includes a written report for merit recommendations for all full-time faculty.
8. The Committee Chairperson, as required by University procedures, will forward materials to the College.

9. To ensure that copies of all promotion, tenure, reappointment, three and five-year reviews and merit materials are placed on file with the Academic Chairperson.

IX. APPEALS

The faculty member has the right to appeal any negative department recommendation affecting his/her promotion, reappointment, tenure or merit. A base merit recommendation is not considered a negative recommendation and cannot be appealed.” (See Towson University Faculty Handbook, Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Permanent Status Appeals-Negative Recommendations).

X. STATEMENT ON CONFIDENTIALITY

All of the faculty's or Committee’s deliberations for promotion, tenure, reappointment and merit shall remain confidential.

XI. CALENDAR (Tenure/Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty Calendar, see Appendix A)
Appendix A
Department of Nursing Promotion and Tenure Calendar

1. First Friday in May

Formation of Department and College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committees

2. Third Friday in June

A. All of the following documents are due and must be submitted to the department chairperson or designee(s):

   i. Completed and signed AR (Annual Reports Part I and II) or CAR (Chairperson Annual Report I & II) forms

   ii. Current professional curriculum vitae

   iii. Syllabus for courses taught during the year under review

   iv. Evaluation of teaching and advising including student evaluations and grade distributions

   v. Documentation of teaching, scholarship, and service (including other required documents or documents desired for inclusion by faculty member)

B. Faculty submit a list of at least three names of additional faculty to be included in department tenure and or promotion committee (if necessary) to Department Chair and Dean

C. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chair and Dean of the written professional development plan.

3. August 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 year.

4. First Monday in August after the start of the contract year

Faculty who were in full-time positions during the academic year may add additional information to update their files for work completed before June 1.
5. First Friday in September

Department Chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department P&T Committee.

6. Third Friday in September

a. First year tenure-track faculty Statement on Standards and Expectations for new tenure track faculty (SENTF) are finalized with Department Chair.

b. First year clinical faculty member’s Statement on Standards and Expectations for non-tenure-track faculty are finalized with Department Chair.

c. Faculty notify Department Chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

d. College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to the Department PTRM Committee

e. Clinical faculty notify Department Chair of intention to submit materials for consideration of a multiyear contract.

7. Fourth Friday in September

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

8. Second Friday in October

Department PTRM Committee’s recommendation regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment and merit, with vote count, submitted to Department Chair. Note: Reappointment for clinical faculty is also contingent on continued positive performance for the current academic year, funding for the clinical faculty position, and department need in the clinical faculty member’s area of clinical expertise.

9. Fourth Friday in October

a. Department Chair’s written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member’s portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.

b. The Department Chair will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.

c. The Department PTRM Committee report with recommendation and vote count and the Department Chair’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
10. Second Friday in November
All faculty recommendations are delivered by the Department PTRM Chair to the CHP Dean’s Office.

11. November 30
a. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.

b. Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation 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 last known address.

12. Second Friday in October
Department PTRM document due to College PTR Committee if any changes have been made.

13. Second Friday in December
First year tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the Department Chairperson.

14. December 15
Tenure-track faculty in the second year of academic service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

15. First Friday in January
a. Department PTRM Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first year tenure-track and clinical faculty are submitted to the Department Chair.

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

16. Third Friday in January
a. Dean’s written evaluation and recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure added to faculty member’s portfolio.

b. College PTR report with vote counts and recommendations and Dean’s recommendation conveyed in writing to faculty member.

c. Department PTRM Committee and Department Chair recommendation concerning reappointment for first year tenure-track faculty delivered to faculty member and Dean.
d. Documentation for third year review of tenure-track faculty submitted by faculty member to Department Chair or designee.

e. Department Chair recommendations on reappointment of first year faculty must be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

f. College PTR Committee and Dean’s recommendations for promotion and/or multiyear contracts are given to clinical faculty members under review for promotion or a multiyear contract with a copy to the Department Chairperson or designee.

g. College PTR Committee’s recommendation concerning clinical faculty members’ appeals of their departmental PTRM committee’s recommendation in the areas of reappointment, appointment to a multi-year contract, promotion and/or level of merit are delivered to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson.

h. Department recommendations concerning reappointment and, if recommended for reappointment, merit for clinical faculty in the first year of appointment are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.

17. First Friday in February

a. College Dean forwards the summative portfolio including the Committee’s and Dean’s recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost.

b. Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost.

18. Second Friday in February

a. Dean recommendations regarding merit are delivered to the Provost.

b. Dean recommendations concerning reappointment for clinical faculty on one-year contracts are delivered to the Provost.

c. Negative reappointment recommendations for first year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

d. After faculty approval, department documents concerning promotion, tenure, reappointment, appointment to multi-year contracts and merit are delivered to the Chairperson of the University PTRM Committee, if any changes have been made.

19. March 1

First year faculty notified of non-reappointment from University President
20. First Friday in March
   Faculty under third year review must be provided with written and face to face feedback on progress towards tenure

21. Third Friday in March
   a. Provost’s decisions are conveyed to all faculty, department and college PTR committee chairs, department chairs, and college deans.
   
   b. Provost’s decisions concerning any faculty appeals of their college PTR committee’s recommendation is delivered to the appellant.
Appendix B

Department of Nursing Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

Basic assumptions inherent within the standards and expectations for nursing faculty are:

Evidence of competence in classroom and clinical teaching in the area of clinical preparation is expected, as well as a willingness to assume responsibility for teaching in both classroom and clinical settings.

Faculty will develop and maintain professional relationships with persons in academia, the profession, and health care system. These relationships link the faculty and the Department to organizations and populations that are essential to the attainment of the Department’s program outcomes.

The following standards and expectations apply for decisions related to promotion, tenure, reappointment and merit.

I. Assistant Professor

The standards for appointment to Assistant Professor:

A. Teaching and Advising

1. Articulates a clear statement of one’s teaching philosophy
2. Develops carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi
3. Demonstrates current knowledge in the field of instruction including current and emerging trends.
4. Refines, updates, and improves courses as needed on a regular basis.
5. Knowledge about programs and accessible to students

B. Scholarship

1. Qualifications for appointment to tenure track
2. Terminal degree
3. Potential research track

C. Service

1. The standards for tenure-track appointment with strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at time of the tenure decision.
II. Associate Professor

The standards for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor:

A. Teaching and Advising

1. Responsiveness to cultural and individual differences
2. Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation, and grading of students’ performance
3. Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology in one’s teaching
4. Content of courses and teaching processes are supportive of Department and/or program mission
5. Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation
6. Effective instruction as measured by student evaluation
7. Availability to students
8. Reflection and growth in teaching methodology
9. Recognition in the Department, College, and/or University of the quality of one’s teaching
10. If applicable, has met contractual obligations for approved off-campus activities such as sabbatical leave, international teaching exchanges, grant-supported research, etc.
11. Demonstration of teaching excellence and student learning as evidenced but not limited to peer and student evaluations and the faculty member’s teaching narrative
12. Demonstration of growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process.
13. 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.
14. Knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
15. Accurate in the advice given to students
16. Demonstrated effective and successful participation in student advising

B. Scholarship

1. Demonstrates a clearly defined active and ongoing scholarship agenda which reflects evolving depth and breadth in agenda and focus
2. Knowledgeable about alternative approaches to conducting research, including research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting and interpreting results
3. Expertise in methodologies appropriate to one’s scholarship and/or creative agenda
4. Efforts to obtain funding to support one’s scholarship or creative goals
5. Evidence that one’s research agenda or artistic achievement has matured over time
6. Recognition by others of the quality of one’s scholarship
7. Demonstrates the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work in the Department of Nursing in his/her area of specialty
8. Demonstrates tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should include substantive peer reviewed items (e.g., peer-reviewed
publications, grants received, authorship of books or book chapters) in addition to other scholarly activity.

C. Service

1. Involvement in the institution’s faculty governance structure at program, Department, College, University or System levels
2. Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one’s professional expertise, including international faculty exchange
3. Advocacy in addressing important institutional issues
4. Recognition of the quality and impact of one’s service
5. A record of sustained involvement in shared governance related to committees and other activities at the Department, and College, and/or University Level.
6. A record of activities that extend beyond the routine expectations of all faculty members.

III. Professor

The standards and expectations for promotion to Professor: The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

A. Teaching and Advising

1. Self-evaluation of all facets of teaching-learning as identified in Faculty Workload Agreement
2. A statement of one’s teaching philosophy
3. Peer reviews of one’s teaching, including peer observations using Departmental approved tool
4. Evaluations of instruction by students
5. Periodic analyses and interpretations of student evaluations
6. Student projects, products, and achievements
7. Evaluations obtained by means of focus groups
8. Correspondence from students, alumni, or other faculty
9. Course syllabi
10. Standardized test scores/pre-post test results
11. Requests to help others with their teaching
12. Subjective comments of students
13. Teaching methods, materials, and strategies published or presented
14. University curriculum and instructional development grants
15. Teaching awards and nominations
16. International teaching exchange, sabbatical, or consulting contracts
17. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues in advising

B. Scholarship

1. A sustained record of conducting and reporting empirical research in one’s field or a sustained effort in a particular medium or style
2. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field or unique artistic expression.
3. Distinction in the quality of one’s scholarship or creative activity.
4. Demonstrates a clear focus in scholarly activities.
5. Possesses a record of sustained scholarship that has had a substantial impact on their field of study or related to a professional issue/area.
6. Demonstrates evidence of a 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.

C. Service

1. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues.
2. Distinction in the quality of one’s service to the institution at program, Department, College, University or System levels.
3. A sustained record of service at the department level and at the college or university level since his/her promotion to associate professor.
4. 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.
5. Demonstrated mentoring of colleagues in their service activities.

Sources of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching /Advising</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Correspondence from students, alumni, colleagues and administrators</td>
<td>• A description of one’s scholarship and/or creative agenda</td>
<td>• Membership on faculty committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advising records</td>
<td>• Selected products of work such as journal articles, books, technical reports</td>
<td>• Leadership positions in University governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advising evaluations by current students</td>
<td>• Citations by other of one’s scholarship</td>
<td>• Involvement in student activities, organizations and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognized expertise in the content and/or technical skills required for student scholarship</td>
<td>• External evaluations and reviews of one’s work</td>
<td>• A description of one’s agenda for service and of how that service builds on one’s professional expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective guidance and advising that enables students to complete their research or projects</td>
<td>• A summary of requests for reprints of one’s publications</td>
<td>• Provision of in-service education or technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to evaluate the outcomes or products of student scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of emerging needs in one’s field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement, updating and improvement of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of changes is licensure, certification and accreditation standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective participation in course and program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to obtain funding to support course and program development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated leadership in course and program development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated leadership in accreditation and program approval efforts and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination and refinement of own teaching practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes and improvements to course syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods, materials, and strategies published or presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and program proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation on accreditation or program approval teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence from colleagues who have participated on committees that have developed curriculum or conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Membership on editorial boards of scholarly publications |
| Receipt of competitive grants or contracts for research for external and internal funding sources |
| Manuscripts, research proposals and other products of scholarship submitted for publication, funding or dissemination |
| Reports of scholarship or projects in progress |
| Awards or other recognition for the quality on one’s scholarship endeavor |
| Participation in presentations and consultations related to nursing and/or interdisciplinary endeavors |
| Maintaining clinical and/or professional skills |
| Products of synthesis and integration of knowledge |
| External evaluations and reviews of work including professional certifications in nursing |
| Participation in workshops, institutes and other professional continuing education programs |

<p>| Professional consultation |
| Membership in nursing and/or other professional organizations and associations at national, regional, and state levels |
| Committee membership in professional organizations |
| Leadership in professional organizations and associations |
| Service to licensure, certification, or accreditation boards |
| Examples of involvement in professional organizations that is sustained and focused and that draws upon one’s professional expertise |
| Correspondence from leaders in professional organizations and associations |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>accreditation approval</th>
<th>reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Faculty Organization (pb)  
April 2002  
Reviewed 07/2005  
Revised 01/2007  
Revised/Approved 03/2010 (rh) Revised/Approved 4/2011  
Revised/Approved 5/2013  
Revised/Approved 5/2014 (ml)  
Revised/Approved 01/2018 (na)
Appendix C
Department of Nursing Standards and Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for Clinical Faculty

Introduction

The professional skill development and applied practice competencies required in academic nursing programs require faculty who demonstrate professional clinical excellence and currency in their field and who are able to facilitate students’ knowledge, skills, and clinical judgment. These non-tenure track faculty members, designated “Clinical Faculty,” are hired with a high-level of clinical/professional expertise and demonstrated clinical teaching skills.

I. General Principles (note: quoted and/or edited from TU ART Policy Appendix 3) and POLICY FOR CLINICAL FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND MERIT (02-01.08)

   It is neither feasible nor practical to identify in these policies each of the factors to be considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and reappointment. The evaluative process requires the exercise of sound judgment, confidential deliberation and knowledge of the University, its educational mission and objectives. Many and varied factors are considered in the decisional process including, among others, teaching, research, scholarship, scholarly growth and potential, creative activity and service. Accordingly, the evaluative criteria referenced in these policies are not exclusive and will be considered together with other factors deemed necessary to a thoroughly considered and well-informed decision.

II. Clinical Faculty - Description

1. Non-tenure-track clinical faculty members are expected to provide learning experiences and supervision for students in clinical/professional programs in their specialized practice areas as well as service that meets the goals of their department/university. Clinical faculty members are required to sustain a high level of clinical/professional excellence.

2. Clinical faculty members have the protections of academic freedom, due process and fair compensation provided to all Towson faculty members.

3. Clinical faculty participate as voting members in department matters relating to the academic programs in which they are involved excepting matters relative to reappointment, tenure, or promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty. They may have a role in merit recommendations for other faculty, depending upon department policies regarding merit committee structure.

4. They also may serve on College committees in accordance with the Constitution and bylaws of the College and on selected University committees based on applicable membership policies.
5. Definitions

a. Clinical Faculty Ranks “Clinical Faculty” means Clinical Instructors, Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Professors, none of whom are eligible for tenure, all as defined in the current TU ART policy.

b. Clinical faculty titles are granted only to teaching personnel who are associated with teaching departments or units.

c. The prefix “Permanent Part Time” may be applied to any of the ranks as defined as “working at least two (2) days per work week for at least 50 percent but not more than 80 percent of the normal workweek for that position.” Permanent part-time faculty are entitled to the same benefits as full-time faculty, but on a pro rata basis.

d. Clinical faculty appointments may be made with conditional elements (such as visiting).

e. “Clinical/Professional Excellence” is defined as expertise that reflects currency in evidenced-based and/or theory-based practice and is validated by the professional community, as determined by the college.

III. Criteria for Appointment of Clinical Faculty are:

A. Clinical Instructor

Appointment at the Clinical Instructor rank requires a minimum of:

1. A master’s degree in the field and, where appropriate, certification or licensure in the field.

2. A minimum of three years of clinical experience

3. Clear evidence of exceptional and current clinical experience

4. Demonstrated competence in clinical teaching

B. Clinical Assistant Professor

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

1. A doctoral degree in the field and, where appropriate, certification or licensure in the field

2. Three years of clinical/professional experience in the area of the discipline in which the appointment is being made and evidence of currency in clinical/professional practice
3. Demonstrated competence in clinical/professional teaching in the discipline.

C. Clinical Associate Professor

In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor, the Clinical Associate Professor rank requires:

1. Evidence of extensive successful experience in clinical/professional practice in a field of specialization within the discipline and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students) in clinical/professional activities in the field.

2. Evidence of a substantial history of superior clinical teaching ability and scholarly or administrative accomplishments in or related to the clinical/professional program.

3. Evidence of effective and substantial service to the institution and the community and/or the profession.

D. Clinical Professor

In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor rank requires:

1. Evidence of a high degree of excellence in clinical/professional practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding regional and national reputation among colleagues.

2. Evidence of sustained scholarly competence and leadership in the profession.

3. Continuing evidence of effective and substantial service to the institution and the community and/or the profession.

IV. Expectations

A. Faculty in clinical positions are held to the following basic standards and expectations required for all faculty at Towson University. Common workload expectations include:

1. Commitment to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior.

2. Primary concern with teaching effectiveness.

3. Commitment to meet classes as scheduled and be available for advising and consultation through office hours.

4. Commitment to support the mission, strategic plan, and programs at the Department, College, and University levels.
5. Commitment to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and to continued professional
development and scholarly growth (scholarship should be closely related to the clinical areas of
expertise and responsibilities).

6. Willingness to share in the responsibility of faculty governance and to participate each year
in the faculty evaluation process.

B. Role Expectations and Exceptions Relative to Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure but are eligible for reappointment and
multi-year contracts.

2. Clinical Faculty must maintain licensure and/or certification (as appropriate).

3. Clinical faculty will ordinarily be expected to assume the equivalent of an 8-course unit
teaching load primarily in their area of clinical/professional expertise. A majority of their
teaching responsibilities will be in clinical/professional practice courses in
clinical/professional programs and, as appropriate, will include lab teaching and/or direct
clinical/professional teaching and/or clinical/professional supervision. Clinical faculty will
have advising responsibilities in accordance with department expectations.

4. Workload percentages for Clinical Faculty members’ teaching, scholarship, and service
responsibilities are similar to those of tenured/tenure-track faculty with an 8-course unit
instructional load.

5. Clinical faculty will have a well-defined area of clinical expertise and will strive to achieve
ongoing clinical excellence. Teaching, scholarship, and service contributions should
incorporate activities that use this clinical/professional expertise/excellence. Scholarship
should be closely related to the areas of expertise and responsibilities.

Examples of clinical/professional excellence as demonstrated in teaching, scholarship and
service include:

a. Demonstrated excellence in clinical/professional teaching or supervision/mentoring (via
peer and student evaluations, awards, peer-reviewed presentations and publications, etc.).

b. Demonstrated excellence in current clinical/professional practice (e.g. certifications,
awards, special recognitions, supervisor and peer evaluations, etc.).

c. Dissemination of clinical knowledge and expertise through publications, presentations,
written reports of scholarly work, or other scholarly activities. The dissemination of these
scholarly contributions may be at the local/state/regional level, national or international
level and may include requests from peers, professionals, or community members to share clinical knowledge and expertise in a professional forum or via consultation.

d. Involvement in service activities on and off campus that use the faculty member’s clinical/professional expertise (e.g., committees, programs, consultations, etc.) with a substantial impact attributed to the faculty member.

V. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty for Reappointment, Merit, and Promotion

A. Clinical faculty will have workload agreements, which are approved by the Department Chairperson and Dean.

B. Clinical faculty will follow the standard promotion, reappointment, and merit process for submitting workload and annual report documents.

C. Clinical faculty will follow the Promotion, Reappointment, and Merit Calendar for Clinical Faculty.

D. Clinical faculty will be evaluated annually for merit using approved Department criteria in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship, and service as is appropriate for clinical faculty. Clinical faculty must include evidence of currency/excellence in clinical practice in the area(s) of clinical/professional teaching/supervision.

E. Clinical faculty may be evaluated for three-year contracts and for promotion in accordance with Department, College, and University documents.

VI. Criteria and Process for Evaluation and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty will be evaluated annually for reappointment based upon fulfillment of expectations for the position.

A. Committee structure for evaluation of Clinical faculty

Department–level evaluation of clinical faculty for promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or a three-year contract will be conducted by the Department of Nursing PTRM Committee. One faculty member elected to the Department PTRM 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. Clinical faculty on the Department PTRM Committee are voting members of the Committee.

B. Reappointment processes:

1. All clinical faculty will submit an evaluation portfolio for review (as per the guidelines for tenured and tenure-track faculty, but also including evidence of clinical excellence) by the date required in the calendar.

2. All clinical faculty members will be evaluated in January of their first year of appointment for recommendation regarding reappointment and merit for the following academic year. Note that
recommendations at this initial evaluation are limited to consideration for base or no merit, and do not include the category of base plus merit.

3. Thereafter, evaluation of the full prior year’s performance will occur in the fall of the following academic year.

4. All reappointments require the approval of the college dean, with reappointment made by the Provost.

C. Reappointment is contingent upon meeting the following criteria:

1. Departmental need, which may be influenced by the number of students in the program and area of specialty.

2. Satisfactory performance of the clinical faculty member in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.

3. Evidence of on-going clinical excellence in the area(s) in which they are engaging in clinical/professional teaching/supervision, scholarship, and/or service.

D. Three-year contract recommendations

1. Initial three-year contracts:

Upon request by the clinical faculty member, clinical faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and higher may be considered for a three-year contract as follows:

a. The clinical faculty member at least meets the following college-level criteria: has had three consecutive positive annual reviews of performance in the immediate past three years as a clinical faculty member by both the department committee and department chairperson. Positive annual reviews include at least satisfactory performance in all three aspects of the clinical faculty role and evidence of sustained clinical/professional excellence.

b. The Clinical Faculty member must request review for consideration of a three-year contract at least by the third Friday in September in the year prior to beginning of the three-year contract. The request must be submitted to the Department Chair.

c. The Clinical Faculty member submits a summative evaluation portfolio reflecting accomplishments in teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and evidence of ongoing Clinical/Professional Excellence.
d. The Department PTRM Committee and the Department Chairperson may recommend reappointment for a three-year contract based on Department need and criteria for evaluation of clinical faculty performance.

A three-year contract requires a positive recommendation of both the Department of Nursing PTRM Committee and the Department Chairperson. The Dean of the College also must support a recommendation of a three-year contract prior to the request being forwarded to the Provost. Three-year contracts are granted upon approval of the Provost.

2. Subsequent three-year contracts:

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

VII. Merit Recommendations

A. Merit review shall be concurrent with annual review. All clinical faculty, regardless of length of contract appointment, will be evaluated annually for merit.

B. The criteria for merit for clinical faculty:

1. Follow University, College, and Department guidelines and standards, and

2. Include evidence of clinical excellence.

VIII. Promotion Recommendations

A. Clinical faculty at all ranks (except Clinical Professor) are eligible for review for promotion.

B. The minimum number of years in rank is six years full-time University teaching for Clinical Associate Professors and a minimum of ten years for Clinical Professor. Review will normally occur no earlier than the sixth-year in a clinical faculty position.

C. The Department of Nursing PTRM Committee and the Department of Nursing Chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion.

D. Normally a three-year contract is recommended when there is a recommendation for promotion if requested by the faculty member.
E. Promotion recommendations are also made by the College PTRM Committee and the College Dean.

F. Promotions are approved by the Provost.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION
1. TEACHING and ADVISING
   a. Standards by rank
      1. The standards for the rank of **Clinical Instructor** include demonstration of:
         i. Knowledge of the field in which the faculty member is teaching, including current and emerging trends
         ii. Growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process
         iii. Effective clinical/professional teaching and student learning in the designated area of expertise
      2. The standards for the rank of **Clinical Assistant Professor** include demonstration of:
         i. knowledge of the field(s) in which the faculty member is teaching, including current and emerging trends
         ii. growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process
         iii. effective clinical/professional teaching and student learning in the designated area of expertise
         iv. effective and successful participation in student advising
         v. participation in mentoring activities to support effective teaching and/or advising
      ii. In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant Professor, for promotion to **Clinical Associate Professor** the following standards include demonstration of:
         i. refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses that one teaches
         ii. superior clinical/professional teaching ability and student learning in the designated area of expertise
         iii. continued growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process
         iv. continued effective and successful participation in student advising
         v. continued participation in mentoring activities to support effective teaching and/or advising
      iii. In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant and Clinical Associate Professor, for promotion to **Clinical Professor** the following standards include demonstration of:
         i. sustained excellence in clinical/professional teaching and student learning in the designated area of expertise
ii. effective and successful participation 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

iii. mentoring of colleagues in teaching and/or advising

iv. a sustained record of excellence in teaching and advising

b. Potential examples and evidence for faculty members to present when demonstrating compliance with the above teaching and advising standards are in Appendix B1.

2. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship may take on many different forms for the Clinical Faculty member including the scholarship of teaching, application, discovery, and integration. All scholarly activities should reasonably align with the clinical/professional areas of expertise and responsibilities, be predominantly clinically/professionally-based and be disseminated and validated.

Scholarship should include both scholarly activities and professional development activities. Examples of these activities are noted in Table 1 below.

Standards by rank

(1) The standards for the rank of Clinical Instructor include

i. An area of expertise that can be developed into a scholarship plan that reflects the potential for ongoing growth in the designated area of expertise

ii. Currently in the knowledge base supporting one’s designated area of expertise that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank

iii. Enrollment in or application in process for a doctoral program

(2) The standards for the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor include:

i. A clearly defined area of expertise that can be developed into a scholarship plan that reflects the potential for ongoing growth in the designated area of expertise

ii. Currency in the knowledge based supporting one’s designated area of expertise that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.

iii. Integration and application of one’s professional scholarly activities to teaching or service or other professional activities.

iv. Begin and continue over time dissemination of one’s scholarly activities in one’s area of expertise.

(3) The standards for promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor include:

i. Demonstrated evidence that one’s scholarship plan has matured over time.

ii. Currency in the knowledge base supporting one’s designated area of expertise that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.
iii. Integration and application of one’s professional scholarly activities to teaching and service or other professional activities.
iv. Demonstrated continued dissemination of one’s scholarly activities in one’s area of expertise.
v. Recognition by others of the quality of one’s scholarship.

(4) The standards for promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor include:

i. A sustained record of scholarship activity within one’s designated area of expertise that is validated and disseminated to the professional community.
ii. Currency in the knowledge base supporting one’s designated area of expertise; that is demonstrated yearly and over time in rank.
iii. A sustained record of integration and application of one’s professional scholarly activities to teaching and service or other professional activities.
iv. Demonstrated continued dissemination of one’s scholarly activities in one’s area of expertise.
v. Distinction in the quality of one’s scholarship.
vi. Excellence in mentoring faculty, clinical practitioners, or students in their efforts to integrate or generate new knowledge in the field.

b. Potential examples and evidence for a faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with the above standards:

i. A description of one’s scholarship in their designated area of clinical expertise.
ii. Presenter of a peer reviewed presentation at a local, regional conference, national or international conference.
iii. An invited presenter at a local, regional conference, national or international conference.
iv. Participation in dissemination of clinical expertise via guest lecture, clinical inservice presentation or consultation.
v. Disseminated clinical expertise via regular and ongoing clinical consultation.
vi. Published reviews of scholarly works.
vii. Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others.
viii. Citation by others of one’s scholarship.
ix. Creation of educational materials that demonstrate integration / synthesis of knowledge.
x. Creation of new workshops related to the designated area of clinical expertise.
xi. Participation or submission in a grant or grant application. xii. Participation in clinical research.
xiii. Writing technical reports and/or evidenced-based policy that reflects integration of knowledge.
xiv. Developing and/or writing of monographs or technical reports for publication.
xv. Developing a new case report related to the designated area of clinical expertise for dissemination.

xvi. Publication of a case report related to the designated area of clinical expertise.

xvii. Author or co-author of an article in a peer reviewed or practice journal or a book chapter.

xviii. Awards and other recognition for the quality of one’s scholarship.

xix. External evaluations and reviews of one’s work.

Note: This list provides examples of formats for dissemination and validation, but is not exhaustive.

c. Minimum scholarship criteria for faculty seeking promotion to the ranks of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor are noted in Table 2 below.

3. SERVICE

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

c. Standards of rank

(1) The standards for the rank of Clinical Instructor include the demonstration of:
   i. Service involvement in faculty governance at the program and department level (this does not exclude service at the College or University level)
   ii. Service contributions to the institution and/or profession and/or community that draws upon one’s professional expertise

(2) The standards for the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor include demonstration of:
   i. Service involvement in faculty governance at the program and department level (this does not exclude service at the College or University level)
   ii. Service contributions to the institution and/or profession and/or community that draws upon one’s professional expertise

(3) In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant Professor, for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, the following standards include demonstration of:
   i. Advocacy in a service activity in faculty governance at the department level and college and/or university level and profession and/or community level
   ii. Recognition of the quality and impact of one’s service contributions, particularly at the department and/or college levels
In addition to meeting the standards for Clinical Assistant and Clinical Associate Professor, for promotion to Clinical Professor, the following standards include demonstration of:

i. a sustained record of service activity in faculty governance at the department and college and/or university levels

ii. advocacy in addressing important issues or needs

iii. participation in mentoring of colleagues within the department

iv. leadership in addressing important institutional, professional, or community issues

v. distinction in the quality of one’s service at multiple levels of faculty governance (department and college and/or university) and profession and/or community

Potential examples and evidence for a faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with the above standards are found in Appendix B2.

1. **X. Appeals**

   1. Clinical faculty on a multi-year contract have the right to appeal negative Department and/or College recommendations regarding promotion or merit.

   2. Clinical faculty on a one-year contract have the right to appeal a negative merit recommendation when this is accompanied by a recommendation for reappointment.

   3. Clinical faculty will follow the same guidelines for appeal as outlined in the current ART policy.
## Appendix D
Scholarship, Promotion Requirements, and Activities for Clinical Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Instructor</th>
<th>Clinical Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Clinical Associate Professor</th>
<th>Clinical Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrates current knowledge and clinical expertise into teaching, scholarship, and service activities.</td>
<td>Integrates current knowledge and clinical expertise into teaching, scholarship, and service activities.</td>
<td>Integrates current knowledge and clinical expertise into teaching, scholarship, and service activities.</td>
<td>Integrates current knowledge and clinical expertise into teaching, scholarship, and service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a focused area of scholarly expertise that is disseminated and validated at the university or local level or higher.</td>
<td>Develops a focused scholarship plan based on scholarly expertise that evolves over time and is disseminated and validated at the state/regional level or higher.</td>
<td>Sustains a focused scholarship plan based on scholarly expertise that is disseminated and validated at the national level or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminates and/or validates scholarly work though at least three professional peer or non-peer reviewed venues (includes grant submission/awards, articles, technical/policy reports, books, chapters, editorship, oral/poster presentations, etc).</td>
<td>Disseminates and/or validates scholarly work through at least three peer reviewed professional venues including one substantive peer reviewed item (i.e. publication or external grant/contract award, book/chapter authorship).</td>
<td>Disseminates and/or validates scholarly work in at least three peer reviewed evidence based professional venues at the national level or higher, including at least two substantive peer reviewed items (i.e. evidence based publications or external grant/contract awards).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Professional Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations (oral/poster)</td>
<td>Continuing Education/CEU Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing research/evidence based projects</td>
<td>Clinical Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer reviewer (journals, articles, books, conference abstracts)</td>
<td>Conference Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant/Contracts</td>
<td>Certification Preparation Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursuit of Terminal Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

FACULTY EVALUATION TOOLS

Student Evaluation of Teaching (Course/Instructor)

Please respond to the items below as they relate to your learning experience in this course. Select the option that best describes your experience. Your answers are confidential and provide valuable feedback to the instructor and University.

### Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>was the main reason you enrolled in this course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 It was a requirement for the major or the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 It fulfilled a Gen. Ed. requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 It provided me with professional development or career training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 It fit my schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Someone recommended the course or the instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 I was interested in the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course's attendance record for this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Never miss a class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Missed 1 or 2 classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Missed 3 or 4 classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Missed 5 or more classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About how many hours per week, in addition to your class session (traditional or online), do you spend preparing for this course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Less than 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 - 2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 3-4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 5-6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 7 or more hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What grade do you expect in this course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course learning objectives were clearly described in the syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course was clearly organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments/tests reflected the primary content of this course as set out in the course learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course learning objectives were met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the requirements for course grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was challenged intellectually by the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized presentations clearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained concepts clearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had high expectations for my learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided guidance in meeting the course learning objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned grades according to stated criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback on my performance as the course progressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was available for consultation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged me to do my best</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the instructor was:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excelent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Ended Questions**

**What do you like about this course?**

**What could be improved about this course?**

**Would you recommend this class to others? Why or why not?**
### DEPARTMENT OF NURSING EVALUATION OF CLINICAL INSTRUCTOR

Instructor Name: ___________ Course: ________ Semester: ___________ Year: ________

The Department of Nursing at Towson University is requesting your response on the following evaluation to assess components of this course. This data is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the nursing curriculum to better meet the needs of student body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My clinical instructor:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriented me to the clinical setting.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the course learning objectives to provide opportunities to enhance clinical competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in my application of nursing knowledge in the clinical setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in the further development of my critical thinking skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to strengthen my organizational skills and prioritize client care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to identify resources to enhance client care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered my ability to serve as an advocate for clients and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated my skill performance and provided feedback for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated my nursing practice as it related to development and implementation of a plan of care for clients and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback about my overall performance on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated clinical conferences that contributed to my learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upon completion of the course, I feel my clinical instructor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treated me with respect.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicated openly and professionally with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced my ability to apply theory to practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a scale of one to five please evaluate your clinical instructor on the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My practicum instructor:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided the support and advisement needed for me to begin this clinical course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was readily available for advisement via phone and email as needed throughout the clinical course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided me with encouragement throughout the clinical course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback about my overall performance on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upon completion of the course, I feel my practicum instructor:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treated me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated openly and professionally with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced my overall experience in my nursing education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted me in identifying my professional role and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPARTMENT OF NURSING EVALUATION OF PRACTICUM INSTRUCTOR

Instructor Name: ____________ Course: _____ Semester: ____________ Year: _______
The Department of Nursing at Towson University is requesting your response on the following evaluation to assess components of this course. This data is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the nursing curriculum to better meet the needs of student body.

On a scale of one to five please rate your practicum instructor on the following items.
Appendix F
Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching

Department of Nursing -- College of Health Professions

I. PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

Desired Outcome: The faculty member is a role model of professional behavior in interactions with students and University/agency personnel.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Integrity and interest in the welfare of the University and/or the clinical agency.
2. Consideration of the institutional policies of the University and/or the clinical agency.
3. Courtesy and respect toward students and University/agency personnel.
4. Availability to staff/colleagues and students.
5. Personal behavior appropriate to professional setting and situation.

II. CRITICAL THINKING

Desired Outcome: The faculty member engages in teaching-learning activities which promote critical thinking.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Clearly stated goals and objectives for selected experiences.
2. Appropriate teaching-learning methodologies to meet objectives.
3. Setting of objectives for learning experience which are consistent with course objectives, client needs, and student learning needs.
4. Promoting student reflection on and analysis of learning needs and evaluation of achievement.
5. Supportive feedback to encourage and to affirm appropriate student actions.
6. Posing of questions requiring student to analyze own learning experience.
7. Making suggestions or recommendations for improvement or continued professional growth.
10. Integration of theoretical knowledge into the practice of professional nursing.
11. Facilitation of student application of nursing concepts.
12. Assistance to students in anticipating potential problems/new experiences and preparing for them.
13. Encouragement of students to examine experiences from diverse viewpoints and perspectives.
14. Use of methodologies appropriate to learning needs of students, subject matter, and/or other contextual variables.

III. COMMUNICATION AND GROUP PROCESS

Desired Outcome: The faculty member facilitates student learning and faculty interaction through the use of appropriate communication techniques and group process skills.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Encouragement of mutual exchange between members during group interactions.
2. Demonstration of respect for group members.
3. Maintenance of eye contact when communicating with others.
5. Asking of open-ended questions.
6. Avoidance of interruption of members.
7. Sensitivity and concern to others during communication process.
8. Supportive non-verbal communication.
9. Goal-directed exchanges between persons to facilitate student learning.
10. Encouragement of students to examine a variety of perspectives.
11. Discernment of confusion and clarification of subject matter when necessary.
12. Provision of opportunities for questioning and student input.

IV. NURSING KNOWLEDGE

Desired Outcome: The faculty member communicates relevant nursing knowledge to prepare students to function as baccalaureate level, generalist nursing practitioners.

Critical behaviors which demonstrate achievement of the desired outcome may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Creation of an atmosphere conducive to learning.
2. Knowledge of the profession of nursing and of the specific clinical discipline.
3. Clearly stated expectations/goals for the learning experience.
4. Appropriate teaching-learning methodologies to meet established goals.
5. Preparation for the teaching-learning experience.
6. Emphasis of significant nursing concepts.
7. Enthusiasm in communicating nursing knowledge.
Faculty Evaluation of Teaching (classroom or clinical)

Department of Nursing -- College of Health Professions

Check one
PEER EVALUATION
FACULTY SELF ASSESSMENT

NAME
RANK

DATE
SETTING

STUDENTS
Indicate number and class level (sophomore, junior, senior)

COURSE

TOPIC (or area of focus)

OBJECTIVES

TEACHING METHODOLOGIES USED

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION OF METHODOLOGIES

CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES IMPACTING ON LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Using the attached guidelines, comment in writing about the faculty member's performance. (Note: Each guideline may not apply in every situation. The guidelines, however, serve as a guide for developing evaluative statements concerning the faculty member's performance.)

EVALUATIVE SUMMARY
Evaluator's name and rank
signature of evaluator
date
COMMENTS OF EVALUATEE

________________________________________________________
Signature of evaluatee                                         date

Date of preconference __________________________                  date of post conference

Additional follow-up indicated   Yes   No
if yes, date of follow-up conference

pb 3/96
(09/97pb) wpdocs\faculty\n4/2011
5/2014
Faculty evaluated:
Course:
Faculty evaluator:

I. Course Checklist

___ Syllabus contains all required sections including:
• Contact information
• Text/Resource Information
• Hardware/Software requirements and information on how to obtain necessary software
• Student Learning Outcomes
• Grading Criteria
• Grading Scale
• Instructor Bio
• Time Requirements
• Policies and Procedures

____ Calendar available and up-to-date.
____ Course orientation
____ Course organized in modules that include content, assessments, assignments, discussions, etc.

II. Course Criteria
Please rate your peer on the following criteria using the following scale.

4 = Exceptional performance; exceeds performance expectations.
3 = Consistently meets and at times exceeds performance expectations.
2= Consistently meets performance expectations.
1 = Needs Improvement

* Note: Those elements checked as “Needs Improvement” require comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Technology</th>
<th>4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course operates smoothly; instructor uses standard technologies, makes appropriate use of available course management tools and other technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Content</th>
<th>4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear presentation of principles and concepts, incorporation of real world examples and applications, and a variety of information types. Learning outcomes reflect knowledge, reinforcement, or application levels. Writing style is clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Media</th>
<th>4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple media types are used to present content and to provide activities and interactions among peers and with instructor. Provisions are made for varied learning styles. Learner navigation and controls are available and consistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Instructional Design</th>
<th>4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course construction, content presentation, features, and navigation are logical and support the learner. Content is relevant to the course and free of unnecessary links and information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Pedagogy</th>
<th>4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course is learner-centered; teacher serves as facilitator, guide, or mentor. Sound pedagogy is evident. Multiple types of interactions are possible; environment is safe and encouraging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activities provide multiple opportunities for reflection and critical thinking. Communication tools are used to create activities and for interactions. Performance expectations and instructor availability are explicit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assignments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety of active learning opportunities are available. Assignments are consistent with content presentation and learning objectives. Assignments are appropriate to course level and subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment strategies are varied and consistent with content presentation, learning objectives and assigned activities. Formative and summative assessments are used; instructions are clear; feedback is provided to the student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content was provided in a variety of accessible modalities and formats to accommodate a broad range of student learning needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature:_____________________________________ Date:______________

Comments:

KTO/BF 4/2013
Reviewed/Revised 01/2018 (na)
Department of Nursing
Student Evaluation of Foundations Course Clinical Skills & Simulation Lab Instructor

Course Example NURS 999-101

Instructor's Name

Semester and Year Example: FA2011

Course Code/Number

The Department of Nursing at Towson University is requesting your response on the following evaluation to assess the teaching component of this course. These data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the nursing curriculum to better meet the needs of the student body.

On the agreement scale, please evaluate your lab instructor on the following items. When responding, fill in the oval completely using a pencil or a dark color pen (blue or black)

example: O O O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My lab instructor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used the course learning objectives to enhance my critical thinking skills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted me in developing and applying my nursing knowledge through the simulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab setting to improve my competency levels in patient/client care.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to strengthen my organizational skills and prioritize client care.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated my skill performance and provided feedback for improvement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged self-evaluation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated small group discussions that contributed to my learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the course, I think my lab instructor:

| Treated me with respect.                                                          | 0              | 0     | 0       | 0        | 0                 | 0           |
| Communicated openly and professionally with me.                                  | 0              | 0     | 0       | 0        | 0                 | 0           |
| Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.                            | 0              | 0     | 0       | 0        | 0                 | 0           |
| Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.                      | 0              | 0     | 0       | 0        | 0                 | 0           |
| Enhanced my ability to apply theory to practice.                                 | 0              | 0     | 0       | 0        | 0                 | 0           |

Would you like to provide any additional input?

Feel free to use the back of this form for additional input, thank you.
Department of Nursing
Student Evaluation of Faculty Academic Advising

Please fill out this form to evaluate the effectiveness of faculty advising. Your feedback is important to us and will help us to improve the advising of nursing and pre-nursing students. We thank you in advance for assisting us in developing strategies to make the advising process meet your needs.

My advisor’s name:

**Overall Rating of My Advisor** (5=excellent, 1=poor) 5 4 3 2 1

What I appreciated about my advisor was:

I recommend that my advisor:

Other comments:

**Your name (optional)**

---

Adapted from Towson University Freshman advising form.

*Thank you for your response*
Faculty(pb)
04/2000
3/2010
4/2011
5/2013
/2014
10/2017 (na)
# Student Evaluation Ratings: Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course &amp; section</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester/Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents/Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained concepts clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned grades according to stated criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback on my performance as the course progressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was available for consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged me to do my best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Instructor Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean of all semester courses: 4.52

5/Strongly Agree; 4/ Agree; 3/ Neither Agree nor Disagree; 2/ Disagree; 1/ Strongly disagree

## Qualitative Summary

## Faculty Response to Evaluation/ Recommendations
### Qualitative Summary

#### Faculty Response to Evaluation/Recommendation

- Oriented me to the clinical setting.
- Used the course learning objectives to provide opportunities to enhance clinical competence.
- Assisted in my application of nursing knowledge in the clinical setting.
- Assisted in the further development of my critical thinking skills.
- Helped me to strengthen my organizational skills and prioritize client care.
- Helped me to identify resources to enhance client care.
- Fostered my ability to serve as an advocate for clients and families.
- Evaluated my skill performance and provided feedback for improvement.
- Evaluated my nursing practice as it related to development and implementation of a plan of care for clients and families.
- Encouraged self-evaluation.
- Provided feedback about my overall performance on a regular basis.
- Facilitated clinical conferences that contributed to my learning.
- Treated me with respect.
- Communicated openly and professionally with me.
- Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.
- Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.
- Enhanced my ability to apply theory to practice.
- Assisted me in making the clinical a valuable experience.
- Assisted me in identifying my professional role and responsibilities.

### Grand mean of all semester courses:

- **5/ Strongly Agree; 4/ Agree; 3/ Neither Agree nor disagree; 2/ Disagree; 1/ Strongly Disagree**

---

**Student Evaluation Ratings: Clinical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course &amp; section</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester/Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents/Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriented me to the clinical setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the course learning objectives to provide opportunities to enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinical competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in my application of nursing knowledge in the clinical setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in the further development of my critical thinking skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to strengthen my organizational skills and prioritize client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped me to identify resources to enhance client care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered my ability to serve as an advocate for clients and families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated my skill performance and provided feedback for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated my nursing practice as it related to development and implementation of a plan of care for clients and families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback about my overall performance on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated clinical conferences that contributed to my learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated openly and professionally with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced my ability to apply theory to practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted me in making the clinical a valuable experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted me in identifying my professional role and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Instructor Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand mean of all semester courses:**
### Qualitative Summary

5/ Strongly Agree; 4/ Agree; 3/ Neither Agree nor disagree; 2/ Disagree; 1/ Strongly Disagree

Faculty Response to Evaluation/Recommendation

---

#### Qualitative Summary

- Treated me with respect.
- Communicated openly and professionally with me.
- Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.
- Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.
- Enhanced my ability to apply theory to practice.

---

#### Overall Instructor Average

Grand Mean of all semester courses:

---

#### Instructor Evaluation

| Used the course learning objectives to enhance my critical thinking skills. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Assisted me in developing and applying my nursing knowledge through the simulation lab setting to improve my competency levels in patient/client care. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Helped me to strengthen my organizational skills and prioritize client care. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Evaluated my skill performance and provided feedback for improvement. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Encouraged self-evaluation. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Facilitated small group discussions that contributed to my learning. | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |

---

---

---

---
# Student Evaluation Ratings: Practicum Preceptor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course &amp; section</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>NURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester/Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents/Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Evaluation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided the support and advisement needed for me to begin this clinical course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was readily available for advisement via phone and email as needed throughout the clinical course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided me with encouragement throughout the clinical course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged self-evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided feedback about my overall performance on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated openly and professionally with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was supportive to my personal development as a nurse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped increase my level of confidence in nursing practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced my overall experience in my nursing education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted me in identifying my professional role and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Instructor Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand mean of all semester courses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/ Strongly Agree; 4/ Agree; 3/ Neither Agree nor disagree; 2/ Disagree; 1/ Strongly Disagree

**Qualitative Summary**

**Faculty Response to Evaluation/Recommendation**