

**Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science**

**Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit Policies and Procedures**

*(Effective X; revised Spring 2021; approved by OTOS Department 12/15/21; approved by CHP PTRM 1/25/22; approved by University PTRM 5/11/22)*

**Table of Contents**

<b>I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE(S) FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment (PTR), and Merit (M) Committees.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Selection of Committee Members, Alternates, and External Reviewers .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>C. PTR and Merit Committee Chairpersons.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>D. Role of the Department Chairperson .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Types of Reviews .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>B. Confidentiality .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>D. Reporting to Candidates.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>E. Portfolio Materials and Evaluation Processes .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>F. Appeals.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>G. Review of Department PTRM Document .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY &amp; OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A. Expectations and Standards at University, College, and Department Levels .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>B. Teaching and Advising Criteria .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>C. Scholarship Criteria .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>D. Service Criteria.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY &amp; OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>A. Standards and Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>B. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>C. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>V. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY &amp; OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>A. Merit Evaluation .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>B. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Teaching for All Faculty .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>C. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>D. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Clinical Faculty .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>E. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Service for All Faculty .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>APPENDIX B .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>APPENDIX C.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>APPENDIX D .....</b>	<b>24</b>

**Towson University**  
**Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science**  
**Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures**

Conforming with the Towson University Faculty Handbook, the Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science Promotion, Tenure, Rank and Merit Committees administer the systems of faculty evaluation by implementing the provisions set forth in the document "Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty" (TU ART, August 2010).

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

**A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment (PTR), and Merit (M) Committees**

The PTRM Committee is comprised of two committees: the Promotion/ Tenure/ Reappointment/Five-Year Comprehensive Review (PTR), and the Merit Committee.

1. The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment Committee

- a. The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members. The Department chairperson is a non-voting member.
- b. When considering promotion or request for a multi-year contract of clinical faculty, one Clinical Associate Professor must be elected to the committee. Should an appropriately ranked faculty member not be available, a member from outside the department but within the College of Health Professions will be selected.
- c. When considering reappointment for clinical faculty, one Clinical Faculty with three years full time in rank must be elected to the committee. Should an appropriately ranked faculty member not be available, a member from outside the department but within the College of Health Professions will be selected.
- d. When considering promotion for tenured or tenure-track faculty, two members are to be above the promotion candidate's rank. Should an appropriately ranked faculty member not be available, a member from outside the department but within the College of Health Professions will be selected.
- e. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may still participate on the PTR committee. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, they must be present to review materials and participate in all deliberations and discussions.
- f. In any case where an appropriately ranked faculty member is not available for a committee, per the TU ART, the additional faculty members shall be selected from a list of at least three (3) faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review. The faculty member shall submit the list of recommended faculty members on or before the third Friday in June. The department chairperson and the dean will review the list from the appropriate college and make recommendations by the first Friday in September. The college PTRM committee will select the additional faculty member(s) to be added to the committee on or before the third Friday of September of the review year.

2. The Merit Committee

- a. The Merit Committee is composed of four voting members. The Department chairperson is a non-voting member
- b. The Committee composition will include one representative from each rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, assistant professor) who have served at least three full years at the University; and one clinical faculty member who has served at least three years full time in rank.
- c. When there are not enough appropriately ranked faculty members available to serve, at least two tenured/tenure-track ranks will be represented.

**B. Selection of Committee Members, Alternates, and External Reviewers**

1. The Department PTR chairperson, in consultation with the chairperson of the Department of OTOS, will hold an election in April of each year to determine the members of the Merit committee according to the TU ART calendar. The Merit committee will be formed by the first Friday in May.
2. A ballot will be formed that meets department criteria, and an election will be held for the Merit (annual) Committee. The members of the Merit committee are elected by all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty. The faculty members at each rank receiving the highest vote count will be elected to the Merit committee, and the

faculty members receiving the next highest vote count will be designated as clinical and TT/T alternates. Alternates will serve in the case of a vacancy and when a committee member cannot serve, and during the review of the elected members' own materials.

3. Term of Office on Merit Committee and as an Alternate will be for one year.

#### **C. PTR and Merit Committee Chairpersons**

1. Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty serving on the PTR and Merit committees.
2. The Committee chairpersons are elected each year by majority vote of the members of the PTR and Merit Committees at the first meeting of the academic year.
3. The PTR and Merit committee chairpersons are responsible for:
  - a. Guiding the PTRM process to ensure that it follows the policies and procedures outlined in this document.
  - b. Chairing all meetings, completing all appropriate documentation, and securing all necessary signatures.
  - c. Initiating and guiding review and revision of the PTRM document according to the timeline established by the TU ART.
4. Should the chair position be vacated, the PTR or Merit committee will elect a new chair, with nominee consent, at the next scheduled PTR meeting.

#### **D. Role of the Department Chairperson**

1. The chairperson is a non-voting member of the PTR and Merit committees. The department chairperson does not serve as committee chairperson.
2. Consistent with their leadership, communication, governance, and management roles, as specified in the Academic Department Chairpersons' Roles and Responsibilities and the Evaluation of the Academic Chairperson for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment (as a faculty member), and Merit documents (see Faculty Handbook, 03-11.00), the chairperson shall be involved in the development and approval of the annual workload expectations of all faculty in the Department. The chairperson will facilitate these processes within the frameworks of the Towson University Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) and the Annual Review (AR) Part II: Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations for Academic Year documents for new and continuing faculty respectively.
3. Each year, the chairperson shall review all faculty's Towson University Annual Report (AR) Part I: Reporting on Activities for Academic Year document, which describes the correlation between expectations and achievement. The chairperson, following discussion with each faculty member, will provide the Department Promotion and Tenure committees with relevant information about the individual faculty member's overall performance as a member of the Department.
4. The Department chairperson independently completes the reappointment review of first-year tenure-track or clinical faculty documents following submission of materials according to the TU ART timeline
5. The Department chairperson may submit a separate recommendation related to faculty member's application for merit and for reappointment review.
6. The Department chairperson shall submit a separate recommendation related to each faculty member's application for tenure, promotion, and comprehensive five-year review.
7. The Department chairperson must make the faculty member aware of any additional information included in the portfolio.

## **II. POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE**

### **A. Types of Reviews**

1. The PTR committee will review, as required, evaluation portfolios for the following types of reviews: tenure, promotion, reappointment/annual, comprehensive five-year, third-year, and first year if indicated. The Merit committee will review materials related to merit.

### **B. Confidentiality**

1. Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of information provided to candidates or departments by the department chairperson or the Dean in performance of their duties under the TU ART policy. Breaches in confidentiality will be reported as appropriate.
2. All votes will be by individual confidential ballot and tallied by the PTR and Merit committee chairs.

3. The PTR committee chair will forward a signed, dated voting record form of the result of the votes and the committee's recommendations to the Dean's Office. The confidential ballots regarding promotion and tenure will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the faculty member's file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

### **C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios**

1. Recommendations made by the department PTR and Merit committees are dependent on the standards and expectations developed in accordance with Appendix 3 to the TU ART policy, University Standards and Expectations, the College of Health Professions (CHP) Promotion and Tenure Policy document, the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Document, and the Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science PTRM document.
2. Definition of a Quorum: A quorum shall be 80% of the voting members. Deliberations and voting may not occur without a quorum.
3. Deliberations: The Committee members review the submitted evaluation portfolio materials to determine achievement of standards and criteria. Alternate members will serve as needed.
  - a. No faculty member may be present during deliberations or voting on their own evaluation portfolio, nor evaluation portfolios for relatives, family members, or other persons indicated under Towson University's nepotism or conflict of interest policies.
  - b. Positive or negative recommendations for PTR and M are decided by majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed and discussed again by the eligible voting members and voted on a second time. If the vote remains tied, the lower rating will prevail.
  - c. The PTR committee completes its deliberations before the Merit Committee begins its deliberations.
4. Voting: After careful review of evaluation portfolios, each PTR and Merit committee member will vote.
  - a. In order to vote for promotion, tenure, reappointment, merit, or comprehensive five-year review, committee members must have participated in the review of materials and be present for all discussions and the vote.
  - b. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive five-year review taken by any committee will be by individual confidential ballot and tallied by the PTR and Merit committee chairs. No committee member shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest. A majority vote is more than 50% of committee members.
  - c. The PTR chairperson records and dates the result of the votes on the faculty member's Department Summary Recommendation Form (DSR).
  - d. The Department chairperson shall forward a signed, dated report of the final result of the vote and the committee's recommendation to the Dean's office.
  - e. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be preserved with the faculty member's file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university in accordance with the TU ART procedures [III.A.5.].
  - f. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may only vote by absentee ballot for committee leadership and committee membership.

### **D. Reporting to Candidates**

1. After each deliberation and vote, the Department PTR and Merit committees shall prepare concisely written but detailed recommendations which include the vote count, and is supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service.
2. Reappointment letters will focus on the period of review. Letters for tenure-track faculty may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback on progress towards tenure to the candidate. All Committee members sign the report indicating that they have read it.
3. Merit letters are brief with the exception of letters needed to support a not-meritorious recommendation which requires additional information to support the recommendation.
4. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters should provide a clear and concise summative evaluation and focus on the period of review and support the PTR committee's deliberations and vote.
5. The Committees' recommendation letters are submitted to the department chair according to the TU ART.

6. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent recommendation of each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and comprehensive five-year review and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the required deadline.
7. The department chairperson distributes all Committee and Chair recommendations to the individual faculty members being evaluated by the fourth Friday in October. Faculty members shall sign the final recommendations and the DSR form indicating that they have read both.
8. The department chairperson or designee shall submit all signed and dated reports to the Dean's office. In addition, the DSR form, voting record, and required materials will be forwarded according to the TU ART procedures and calendar.
9. Recommendations shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio which is forwarded by the department PTR committee chairperson to the Dean's office in the specified format by the required deadlines.

#### **E. Portfolio Materials and Evaluation Processes**

1. The faculty member under evaluation is responsible for preparing, organizing, and submitting materials by the required deadline, and in the appropriate format, as stipulated in the TU ART calendar.
2. The faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions as they deem appropriate in narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section. All documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio. The type of review determines both portfolio material and process.
3. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized and indexed by the faculty member. Due dates for all materials are outlined in the PTRM calendar (refer to the TU ART and Appendix A). The following reviews occur:
  - a. First-Year Review – The primary purpose of this review is to evaluate a first-year faculty member's performance in their first semester and make a recommendation for reappointment. The department chairperson is responsible for conducting first-year reviews. Review materials submitted should include:
    - i. Current CV
    - ii. SENTF
    - iii. One peer evaluation of teaching and another indicator of teaching effectiveness
    - iv. Two page, single-spaced narrative statement of workload progress in teaching, scholarship and service.

First year tenure track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson by the second Friday in December, per the TU ART timeline. Course evaluation data are added to the portfolio once it becomes available. The Department chairperson will assess the materials to determine the candidate's ability to meet department expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. The Department chairperson will review all relevant documentation for first-year faculty; meet with the candidate to discuss the review; and make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment. The Department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean of the College by the third Friday in January, according to the TU ART timeline. Should the department chairperson's recommendation indicate unsatisfactory performance, the OTOS PTRM Committee will convene to review and complete an independent assessment of the first-year faculty materials. The OTOS PTR Committee will provide a written recommendation to the CHP Dean and OTOS chairperson no later than March 15 of the current academic year, per the TU ART.

- b. Annual Reappointment Review – All non-tenured faculty members receive an annual review based on documentation of activities that occurred during the academic year under review. This review results in recommendations regarding reappointment and/or merit as appropriate. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:
  - i. Section I:
    - Curriculum Vitae, with accomplishments during the period under review highlighted
    - One representative document of scholarly activity during the academic year
  - ii. Section II:
    - Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR) (parts I & II) for the year under review
  - iii. Section III:
    - Student course evaluations administered and tabulated through the University Assessment Office.

- Student course evaluations administered and tabulated through the OTOS Department for low-enrollment courses, if applicable (See Appendix C)
  - Peer evaluations, if applicable
  - Advisor evaluation, if applicable
  - Narrative analysis of qualitative comments from student course and/or advising evaluations during the period under review (2 page maximum)
- iv. Section IV:
- Integrated Narrative (2 pages maximum, single-spaced, addressing teaching, scholarship & service)
- v. Section V:
- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)
- vi. Section VI:
- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service
- c. Clinical Faculty Reappointment Review
- i. Reappointment of clinical faculty is contingent upon evidence of ongoing clinical excellence, which refers to demonstrated expertise in specified areas of clinical practice that support and enhance the faculty member's teaching responsibilities. Teaching, scholarship, and service contributions should incorporate activities that maintain and build upon this clinical expertise/excellence. In addition to the criteria for Annual Reappointment above, Clinical faculty must also meet standards as outlined in this section.
- ii. The ongoing nature of clinical excellence requires some form of clinical activity during the academic year. Documented evidence of expertise outlined in the prior section must illustrate accomplishments achieved during the year under review. Evidence of demonstrated expertise is characterized by one or more of the following:
- Extensive and/or focused years of clinical practice in identified area: provide a description including frequency and activities contributing to your continued excellence [e.g., assignment as resource person in a department for your expertise; completion of professional service consisting of evaluations, interventions, and assisting with student supervision; developing, leading, and/or supervising students in programs and service delivery at the IWB]
  - Current specialty certifications or degrees (specify activities completed supporting certification).
  - Requests for consultation (provide a description including frequency).
  - National reputation in identified professional activities.
  - Publications.
  - Workshop/conference presentations (include attendance certificate or documentation).
  - Clinical teaching (describe activities above and beyond assigned teaching workload that are substantive [e.g., lead a 2-hour workshop on handling techniques for children with cerebral palsy]).
  - Formal program development (describe specific contributions and outcomes).
  - Supervision/mentoring (describe specific activities including frequency, and time frame).
  - Other relevant criteria indicative of clinical expertise.
- iii. Annual documentation and integration of evidence of ongoing clinical excellence is required and may be provided by the following:
- The annual workload agreement by specifying the clinical activities in which the faculty person will engage and describing the ways in which the specified area of clinical excellence will be used to enhance the teaching/learning process in the planned courses.
  - The annual summary of specific clinical activities in which the faculty person engaged, and the manner in which clinical excellence enhanced the teaching/learning process for the previous year should be included as part of the scholarship summary as required for the AR.

- Supporting documents, such as publications, conference proceedings, and consultative reports that demonstrate evidence of ongoing clinical excellence from the previous year must accompany the faculty member's annual integrated narrative.
- iv. Following a second positive annual review, the clinical faculty may request a review for multi-year contract (See II.E.3.m. below).
- d. Third-Year Tenure-Track Review – Tenure track faculty are reviewed after the fall semester of their third year. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and/or promotion and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where potential issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. Faculty members will be evaluated on teaching, scholarship, and service. The Department of OTOS PTR Committee shall follow TU Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty, Appendix 3, Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty Evaluations pertaining to the Third Year Review in conducting the review.
- i. Submission of Materials. The candidate shall submit AR materials for the previous two and one-half years, consistent with the process for application for tenure and/or promotion, to the chairperson no later than the third Friday in January. Materials from the fall semester, including at least peer and student teaching evaluations and advising evaluations as well as any other materials that facilitate a thorough evaluation, should be included. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:
- Section I:
- Curriculum vitae
  - A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication
- Section II:
- University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms arranged from most recent to year of hire
- Section III:
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
  - Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
  - All peer observations
  - Advising evaluations
- Section IV:
- Narrative Statement (maximum five pages single spaced and minimum of 11 point font) describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement should include a clear scholarship plan outlining the activities and progress towards meeting the criteria and standards for promotion.
- Section V:
- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)
- Section VI:
- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service
- ii. Review Process
- (a) Department PTR committee evaluations of the faculty member's review will become part of their file at the department level and shared with the Dean.
- (b) The department PTR committee will evaluate third-year review materials and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service. This statement:
1. Must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion recommendation; and
  2. Must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.
- (c) Tenure-track faculty must demonstrate (a) excellence in teaching (including advising and mentoring) and have (b) a plan for and evidence of scholarly productivity, as well as (c).service activities within different levels of the university and the community. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

1. Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching and advising, significant accomplishments in scholarship, and meeting or exceeding department standards in service.
  2. Satisfactory progress. Requirements include satisfactory progress in teaching and advising, scholarly productivity and service.
  3. Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation indicates less than satisfactory performance and requires change by the faculty member across one or more dimensions. Continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.
- (d) Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chairperson and the department PTR committee chair no later than the 1st Friday in March.
- iii. Accelerated Tenure-Track Review: In the circumstance where a faculty member has been hired on an accelerated tenure-track timetable, or requests an accelerated review, 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.
- e. Promotion and/or Tenure Review - Occurs following the timeline agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the Provost's Office. The purpose of this review is to assess the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the standards and expectations delineated in the TU ART and the CHP and OTOS PTRM documents.
- i. Submission of Materials. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows (unless specified differently in the annual Provost's memo):
    - Section I:
      - Curriculum vitae
      - A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication
    - Section II:
      - University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms arranged from most recent to year of hire
    - Section III:
      - Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
      - Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
      - All peer observations
      - Advising evaluations,
    - Section IV:
      - Narrative Statement (maximum five pages single spaced and minimum of 11 point font) in which the candidate describes how they have met and integrated the teaching, scholarship and service standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Additionally, the statement should include a clear Scholarship Plan outlining activities and goals for the next five years.
    - Section V:
      - Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)
    - Section VI:
      - Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service
  - ii. Tenure Review Process
    - (a) Assistant Professors requesting tenure must also request promotion to Associate Professor at the same time, in accordance with the TU ART calendar.
    - (b) Recommendation for tenure originates in the Department Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment Committee, is forwarded to the Dean of the CHP and the CHP PTRM Committee, and then to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who accepts or rejects the recommendations and notifies the faculty member of the decision.
    - (c) Tenure decisions are based on performance in the areas specified in Section II.B in the Towson University Guidelines for Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations as stated in the TU ART, and Section IV of the CHP PTRM documents.



- (d) The guidelines for the Department's actions regarding tenure are those set forth under Section VI.B Faculty Ranks Used at Towson University in the TU ART document.
  - iii. Promotion Review Process
    - (a) The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Five-Year Review Committee will review requests and materials for promotion.
    - (b) Promotion decisions will be based on performance in the areas specified under Section II.B in the Towson University Guidelines for Development of Departmental Standards and Expectations as stated in the TU ART and the CHP PTRM documents.
    - (c) The guidelines for the Department's actions regarding Promotion, including time and rank, are those set forth under Section VI.B Faculty Ranks Used at Towson University in the TU ART document.
    - (d) Recommendation for promotion is forwarded to the Dean of the CHP and the CHP PTRM Committee, and then to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who accepts or rejects the recommendations and notifies the faculty member of the decision.
  - iv. External Review
    - (a) The candidate for tenure or promotion may request, but is not obligated to provide an external review of scholarship accomplishments for any level EXCEPT promotion to professor. For promotion to professor, external review is required. The candidate must follow procedures and timelines as outlined in the TU ART [Appendix C: Guidelines for External Peer Review]
- f. Comprehensive Five-Year Review – per the TU ART, all tenured faculty shall have a comprehensive review at least once every five years. This review is summative for the period of the preceding five (5) academic years to assess performance over time and provide an opportunity to establish a professional plan to serve as a basis for the next comprehensive review. Faculty will be evaluated on teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.
  - i. Narrative Statement. A critical part of the portfolio shall be a narrative statement (maximum of five pages single spaced and a minimum of 11 point font) in which the faculty member describes how they have met and integrated the teaching, scholarship, and service expectations for the five years under review, including a Scholarship Plan outlining activities and goals for the next five years.
  - ii. Comprehensive Five-Year Review Process
    - (a) The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
    - (b) The following two-level scale will serve as a general guideline for the review:
      1. Satisfactory progress (positive recommendation). Teaching and scholarship outcomes and accomplishments and service responsibilities are commensurate with requirements at faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion.
      2. Unsatisfactory progress (negative recommendation). Teaching and/or scholarship outcomes and/or service responsibilities are not commensurate with faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion.
    - (c) A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and the Dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair, dean and provost.
    - (d) Two (2) consecutive merit reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review.
- g. Three-Year Clinical Contract Review – per the Clinical Faculty Evaluations, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Policy (02-01.08), clinical faculty with three consecutive positive annual reviews of performance in the past three years may request a three-year contract review. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.g).

4. Supplemental materials are required for each type of review, and should include documentation and support for key activities reported in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Materials supporting enhancements to teaching strategies and curriculum design/development and a copy of current Maryland license are included in supplementary materials.
5. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or their chairperson or program director may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the TU ART Calendar. Such information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in their evaluation portfolio or in the department chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in August. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the TU ART Calendar.
6. If information is added to the evaluation portfolio, other than recommendations, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. A failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.
7. If external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio of the faculty member, but will be forwarded under separate cover as the portfolio proceeds through all levels of review.

#### **F. Appeals**

1. The faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment, tenure, promotion or merit negative recommendation. All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative recommendation is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter. There are three (3) types of appeals:
2. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either the department and/or college PTRM Committees, the department chairperson, the Dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance as outline in the TU ART [V.B.2.a.].
3. Procedural appeals related to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, shall follow the procedures as outlined in the TU ART [V.B.2].
4. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and ableness shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University Policy Prohibiting Discrimination (06-01.00).

#### **G. Review of Department PTRM Document**

1. The department shall review its PTRM document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CHP PTRM committee, dean of the college and the university PTRM committee.
2. The department PTRM document, when new or revised, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty members.
3. The vote will be completed using a confidential ballot that includes each faulty member's Towson University ID number, vote, and date. The signature and Towson University ID number of each tenured or tenured-track faculty member on the department voting record will signify that they have voted on the department PTRM documents. Faculty who are on leave from the university (e.g., medical, sabbatical) or who do not vote on the document will be recorded as abstaining.
4. Following approval, the document, along with the transmittal form, shall be forwarded to the College PTRM Committee by the First Friday in December, in accordance with the procedures and dates specified in the TU ART.[ART Feedback is to include the actual date]

### **III. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE**

#### **A. Expectations and Standards at University, College, and Department Levels**

In accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in the Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation (as stated in the TU ART II.B Standards and Expectations), faculty members of the Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science will meet the following University and Department standards and expectations:

## 1. University and College

- a. Faculty members are to abide by University expectations, which are consistent with the USM policies and are outlined in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank (Promotion), and Tenure of Faculty; Towson University Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities; and Towson University Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit documents. Common standards and expectations for all faculty members are as follows:
  - i. A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior.
  - ii. A faculty member is primarily concerned with excellence in teaching.
  - iii. A faculty member meets classes as scheduled and is available for advising and consultation through office hours.
  - iv. A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college, and university.
  - v. A faculty member is committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and is committed to continuing professional development and scholarly growth.
  - vi. A faculty member shares the responsibility of university governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.
  - vii. A tenure-track faculty member must hold a research doctorate from an accredited institution.

## 2. Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science

- a. All faculty members who are occupational therapists must maintain Maryland State Licensure (active status). All regular tenure/tenure-track faculty who are occupational therapists must hold a state license upon hiring. Within one year from date of hire, regular tenure/tenure-track faculty must obtain licensure in Maryland (active status). Faculty who are not occupational therapists must maintain other professional credentials as applicable.
- b. Tenured/tenure-track faculty members maintain contact with practice and the community through professional activities such as consultation, membership in professional associations, and/or research. Clinical faculty members demonstrate evidence of ongoing excellence in the area of clinical specialty.
- c. All faculty members participate in scholarly activity as outlined in the TU ART, CHP, and Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science PTRM documents. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars. The department will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member that shall include evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated. All faculty members participate in departmental activities including course planning, course and curriculum implementation, and course related grievance and appeal procedures.
- d. All faculty members adhere to ethical principles in all teaching, advising, scholarship and service activities.
- e. All continuing faculty members prepare a Towson University Annual Review (AR) Part II: Agreement on Faculty Workload Expectations document in consultation with the department chairperson. This agreement will, at a minimum, include a statement of workload and responsibilities in the three principle areas of teaching/advising, scholarship/research, and service in accordance with the provisions of the Towson University Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (see Faculty Handbook, USM II-1.25).

## 3. Standards and Expectations for New Tenure Track Faculty (SENTF)

- a. New faculty will work with the department chairperson to develop a SENTF, which shall include:
  - i. Towson University and CHP criteria for merit, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
  - ii. Expectations which are unique to the department, which may exceed the Board of Regents' and Towson University's expectations.
  - iii. Expectations which are unique to the position to which the person is appointed.

## 4. Department of OTOS Standards and Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

- a. In addition to the criteria discussed below, faculty must meet standards as outlined in Appendix 3 of TU ART and Section III Standards and Criteria for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service of the CHP PTRM document.

## B. Teaching and Advising Criteria

1. The OTOS PTRM Committee acknowledges that teaching and advising encompass a range of activities and occur in a variety of contexts. The evaluation of teaching and advising for faculty members should rely on evidence of activities which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for teaching and advising on the individual faculty member's workload agreement. These efforts may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to:

- a. Classroom based instruction
  - b. Updating and enhancing current courses with appropriate current content and pedagogy
  - c. Development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement)
  - d. Efforts related to accreditation
  - e. Use of technology to facilitate learning and enrich course delivery
  - f. Off-site learning, community-based and service learning
  - g. Mentoring of student research
  - h. Mentoring related to professional preparation through internships, practical, and clinical fieldwork
  - i. Group and individual career-related academic and professional guidance
  - j. Group and individual advising
  - k. Other aspects of learning and the assessment of student learning
2. Review of teaching will consider the course level, student numbers, and type of pedagogy and engagement in addition to the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.
  3. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes:
    - a. Creating a climate that is conducive to learning
    - b. Respecting diversity, equity, and inclusion
    - c. Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of students
    - d. Supporting the learning process
  4. Evaluation of advising effectiveness includes:
    - a. Demonstration of knowledge of all aspects of the curriculum as exhibited in presentation of the program to prospective students and currently enrolled majors.
    - b. Adherence to Departmental policies regarding inclusion of areas to be addressed during advising and completing departmentally approved forms on all advisees.
    - c. Provision of advising sessions at least once each semester with assigned advisees and one-on-one in-depth advising sessions once each year.
    - d. Collaboration with the department chair and other appropriate faculty in addressing academic and professional behaviors demonstrated by one's advisees.
    - e. Receiving at least satisfactory advising evaluations.
  5. Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness includes:
    - a. Student evaluations
    - b. Advisor evaluations
    - c. Peer evaluations
    - d. Syllabi and other teaching materials
  6. Procedure for evaluation of teaching
    - a. Student Evaluation
      - i. Eight items from the student course evaluations (See Appendix D) are used as key indicators for determining satisfactory performance.
      - ii. Faculty may choose to include data for offload courses.
      - iii. The department chairperson may ask that course evaluation data be added to any faculty's evaluation portfolio if it is deemed important for the review, even if the teaching was done off-load.
      - iv. Faculty may include data obtained in a systematic manner related to course evaluation by students.
      - v. There may be extenuating circumstances in which a particular course will not be included for consideration. Potential exceptions include:
        - (a) Last-minute teaching assignments in response to department need.
        - (b) Assuming additional teaching assignment(s) during the semester in response to department need.
        - (c) Courses for which response rates were low (<33%).
        - (d) New course or new course format – only one course may be excluded one time.
    - b. Peer Evaluation

- i. Peer observations are required for purposes of professional growth, program assessment, and when the faculty member is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive five-year review.
- ii. By August 31 of the academic year, the department chairperson develops a list of faculty for peer observation and makes assignments.
- iii. Each faculty member to be evaluated will be observed at least once by a full-time faculty member during the academic year. It is the mutual responsibility of the reviewer and the faculty member to be observed to schedule the observation in a timely manner that allows for feedback to be incorporated into course delivery.
- iv. The date of observation will be determined at least one week in advance of the scheduled evaluation unless that interval is mutually waived.
- v. Prior to the observation, the faculty reviewer schedules a meeting with the faculty member to be observed. During this meeting, the faculty member to be observed shares class objectives, syllabus, and relevant materials, including access to course Blackboard site.
- vi. The period of observation must be at least 50 minutes.
- vii. Following the observation, the faculty reviewer will complete the evaluation form (Appendix B), assign one of the three rating options (i.e., needs improvement, satisfactory, excellent), and arrange to meet with the observed faculty member to summarize and discuss the evaluation.
- viii. Following this discussion, the peer evaluation form is signed by both the reviewer and faculty member being observed with the original going to the department chairperson placed in the designated folder, and a copy going to the faculty member being observed for their annual review materials. The chairperson emails the reviewer and faculty member being observed when they receive and log the receipt of the peer evaluation.
- ix. Unsatisfactory peer evaluations will be addressed administratively by the department chairperson and faculty member being observed.

### C. Scholarship Criteria

1. The OTOS PTR and Merit Committees value a range of scholarship activities and acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship. The evaluation of scholarship for faculty members should rely on evidence of outcomes which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for scholarship on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.
2. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars.
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. Evidence of outcomes include, but is not limited to, the following:
  - a. Internal and external grant awards
  - b. Peer-reviewed publications
  - c. Book/book chapters
  - d. Peer-reviewed presentations
  - e. Invited presentations

### D. Service Criteria

1. The evaluation of service for faculty members should rely on evidence of service contributions which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.
2. While evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution.
3. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of civic and/or professional service he or she may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the profession, mission of the college and/or university.
4. The following are types of Service-Related Activities:
  - a. University Service: includes substantive participation in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and at the college and/or university level.
  - b. Professional Service: includes participation in professional organizations or in other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national or global).
  - c. Community Service: includes participation in the larger community (e.g., local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that are related to one's academic area of expertise.

#### IV. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Faculty in the Department of OTOS are expected to meet the criteria and standards of the university and college for tenure and/or promotion.

##### A. Standards and Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

1. According to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty ( TU ART ), faculty at the Associate Professor level “shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and successful experience in research, scholarship, and where appropriate, be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of 6 years of full-time university/college teaching. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research. There also shall be evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession.” For Clinical Faculty, refer to the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit document, Section VIII. Promotion Recommendations.
2. Standards for Teaching and Advising
  - a. In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will meet the following standards:
    - i. Demonstration of responsiveness to cultural and individual differences reflected in course content and learning activities.
    - ii. Demonstration of responsiveness to the education standards of the profession through refinement, updating, and improvement of the course syllabi and materials.
    - iii. Demonstration of primarily excellent peer evaluations of teaching.
    - iv. Demonstration of effective instruction as measured by excellent teaching rating on student evaluations for each course taught.
    - v. Demonstration of availability to students through various communication mechanisms, including regularly scheduled office hours, email, telephone, and other forms of communication.
    - vi. If the faculty member has advising responsibilities: demonstration of accessibility to students; knowledge about departmental policies, program, and procedures; and provision of accurate advice as measured by satisfactory advising evaluations.
3. Standards for Scholarship
  - a. Demonstration of the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in faculty member’s area of specialty.
  - b. Demonstration of a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda aligned with the Mission and Vision of the Department. The candidate’s scholarship shall reflect evolving depth and breadth in agenda and focus.
  - c. Demonstration of tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should include a number of substantive peer reviewed publications and other substantive scholarly activity (e.g., peer reviewed national and international presentations, grants received, authorship of books or book chapters) in addition to other scholarly activity.
4. Standards for Service
  - a. Although diverse profiles of service contributions are anticipated among candidates, it is expected that over time, all candidates will demonstrate service in two of the following three domains: to the institution, to community and metropolitan area, and to one’s profession.
  - b. Service to the institution. In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will meet the following standards:
    - i. Involvement in the university’s faculty governance structure at program, department, college and university, or system levels.
    - ii. Contributions to the institution, college and/or department that are focused and draw upon one’s professional expertise.
    - iii. Advocacy in addressing important department and college issues.
    - iv. Recognition of the qualities and the impact of one’s service.
  - c. Service to profession. In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member will demonstrate sustained contributions to professional organizations and associations in one’s field at the state, regional, national, and/or international levels.

- d. Service to community and metropolitan area. In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will demonstrate sustained contributions to community/metropolitan area which draw upon one's expertise and contributes to the mission and vision of the department. This may include advocacy, interdisciplinary activities, or service contributions.

## B. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Professor

1. According to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty, faculty at the Professor level "shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and research, scholarship, or, where appropriate, creative performance. The appointee shall have a minimum of 10 years of full-time university/college teaching. Exceptions may be made for faculty who have attained national distinction for comparable professional activity or research. There shall be continuing evidence of relevant and effective service to the institution, the community, and the profession." According to the CHP Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies, candidates for promotion to Professor also must demonstrate evidence of a national reputation in their area of study, which can take the form of peer-reviewed publications and presentations and/or significant professional leadership roles. (See Appendix F for list of potential evidence for each area.) For Clinical Faculty, refer to the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit document, Section VIII. Promotion Recommendations.
2. Standards for Teaching and Advising
  - a. In addition to meeting the standards for tenure and for associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following standards in teaching:
    - i. Demonstration of consistent excellence in teaching.
    - ii. Demonstration of leadership in mentoring colleagues in teaching.
    - iii. Demonstration of mentoring colleagues in effective advising.
    - iv. Demonstration of mentoring graduate student scholarship through effective guidance and advisement of student scholarship, e.g., capstone projects, comprehensive exams, and dissertations.
    - v. Demonstration of effective and successful participation in course and program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or one's sustained experience with practitioners in one's field.
    - vi. Demonstration of leadership in curricular development and evaluation.
    - vii. Demonstration of contribution to accreditation and program review/ approval activities.
3. Standards for Scholarship
  - a. In addition to continuing to meet the scholarship standards since promotion to associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following standards:
    - i. Demonstration of a clear and substantial scholarship agenda with a record of sustained outcomes that have a substantial impact on their field of study.
    - ii. Evidence of national reputation, which may take the form of peer-reviewed publications and presentations; substantive funded grants; books; leadership in setting accreditation standards for academic programs; invitations to be a reviewer for national/international journals in the field; and/or other forms of scholarship with a major impact. Letters from external reviewers should substantiate this evidence.
    - iii. Demonstration of substantive mentoring of colleagues and/or graduate students in their scholarship activities.
4. Standards for Service
  - a. Although diverse profiles of service contributions are anticipated among candidates, it is expected that, over time, all candidates will demonstrate service in at least two of the following three domains: to the institution, to the community and metropolitan area, and to one's profession.
    - i. Service to the institution. In addition to meeting the standards for tenure and for associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following standards:
      - (a) Leadership in addressing important institutional issues.
      - (b) Distinction in the quality of one's service to the institution at program, department, college and university or system levels.
    - ii. Service to one's profession. In addition to meeting the standards for tenure and for associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will demonstrate leadership in addressing important issues relevant to one's profession.

- iii. Service to community and metropolitan area. In addition to meeting the standards for tenure and for associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following additional standards:
  - (a) Leadership in addressing community issues in one's field.
  - (b) Distinction in the quality of one's community service or performance.

**C. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty**

1. Clinical assistant and associate faculty are eligible for review for promotion and must present evidence to substantiate the promotion decision using criteria outlined in the College of Health Professions Guidelines for Clinical Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Document and the TU Policy for Clinical Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit (02-01.08).
2. The minimum number of years in rank is six. The department committee and the chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion. If requested by the candidate, a three-year contract may be recommended when there is a recommendation for promotion.

**V. DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT EVALUATION**

Procedure: All faculty shall submit a self-evaluation of merit, outlining the ways in which they have met or exceeded the established criteria for satisfactory and/or excellent merit in teaching, advising, scholarship and service.

**A. Merit Evaluation**

1. Criteria for each evaluation component: Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on rank, the information provided through annual reviews, and on assigned workload effort. There are three (3) categories of merit:
  - a. Needs improvement: Performance fails to meet expected standards.
  - b. Satisfactory : Performance meets standard and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
  - c. Excellent : Performance must exceed expectations. Excellence in one out of three performance categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and satisfactory performance in two out of three of the performance categories.

**B. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Teaching for All Faculty**

1. Needs improvement
  - a. The faculty member's teaching performance failed to meet departmental standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.
2. Satisfactory
  - a. The faculty member's teaching performance met the departmental standards. The faculty member contributed positively to fulfilling the department's teaching goals.
  - b. The faculty member met the following teaching performance standards:
    - i. Received at least satisfactory for all peer evaluations when appropriate to conduct.
    - ii. Constructively used feedback from student and peer evaluations when appropriate.
    - iii. Developed/used appropriate syllabi, handouts, exams, and assignments that are in congruence with curriculum design.
    - iv. Appropriately updated course content to reflect changes in the profession and the curriculum. Maintained course supplies, materials, and equipment.
    - v. Performed appropriate and timely advising when assigned.
    - vi. Participated appropriately in peer mentoring.
    - vii. Was accessible through appropriate use of office hours and other mechanisms.
    - viii. Maintained ethical, and professional behavior, including boundaries with students during teaching and executing academic tasks involving grading, advising, and mentoring; and maintained high ethical standards in relationships and all other academic situations.
    - ix. Maintained confidentiality with student information.
3. Excellent
  - a. The faculty member's performance was extraordinary. In addition to meeting the criteria for satisfactory performance, the faculty member met and has evidence for three of the following seven teaching performance standards:



- i. Received at least one excellent peer evaluation when appropriate or requested to conduct.
- ii. Provided evidence of significant accomplishments in the form of significant improvement to an existing course, application of new technologies, new teaching strategies, or development of new material.
- iii. Developed or co-developed a new course which has been approved by the college curriculum committee.
- iv. Instrumental in University related curriculum assessment/development or outcome evaluation.
- v. Mentored a student(s) in achieving a significant academics-related achievement in a professional organization, scholarly endeavor, or ethical academic integrity beyond standard teaching expectations.
- vi. Mentored a faculty member who wishes to further develop their teaching effectiveness through regular meetings, review of Blackboard sites, course materials, and class observations.

#### **C. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty**

1. The criteria for scholarship is based on the faculty member's workload expectations and achievements as outlined in the Annual Review, Parts I and II. The guidelines below are based on a scholarship level of 20%. Faculty with more time devoted to scholarship should provide evidence of increased productivity. Faculty with less time devoted to scholarship should be reviewed to determine if they met (Satisfactory) or exceeded (Excellent) their scholarship plan as outlined in their Annual Report, Parts I and II. Needs improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet departmental standards for satisfactory scholarship.
2. Satisfactory in scholarship may vary depending on the faculty member's workload expectations (See C.1.). For most tenured or tenure track faculty, a rating of satisfactory involves completion of each of the following during the academic year:
  - a. Disseminated at least one presentation at the local, state, regional, or national level
  - b. Submitted a proposal for a presentation at the state, regional, or national level
  - c. Attended at least one conference/workshop that relates to courses/other professional responsibilities
  - d. Demonstrated currency in areas of professional responsibilities and expertise

In addition, most tenured or tenured track faculty will complete at least one of the following:

- e. Submitted a paper for publication
  - f. Submitted an internal grant proposal as either Primary Investigator or co-Primary Investigator
  - g. Demonstrated ongoing successful progress on awarded grant (re-application for funding, implementation, evaluation)
  - h. Engaged in some equivalent scholarly activity (e.g., participation in grant activity)
  - i. Submitted a book chapter or revisions to a subsequent chapter
  - j. Published in a non-peer reviewed periodical (e.g., OT Practice)
  - k. Developed a curricular module (e.g., CD, DVDs, FAQs, brief report, position paper)
3. Excellence in scholarship for most tenured or tenure track faculty will involve completion of at least one of these listed scholarly products during the academic year:
    - a. Had a publication in a refereed journal or book (e.g., chapter as lead author)
    - b. Edited a book
    - c. Edited a journal issue
    - d. Media educational product (e.g., CD series, DVD program)
    - e. Demonstrated evidence of substantial contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency
    - f. Was a primary presenter at a national or international conference (including IPE)
    - g. Other extraordinary scholarship (e.g., research, scholarly engagement and dissemination relative to grant activity; evidence of grant administration, implementation and/or evaluation; grant review, development of workshops/programs, peer review for refereed publications)

#### **D. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Clinical Faculty**

1. The criteria for scholarship is based on the clinical faculty member's workload expectations and achievements as outlined in the Annual Review, Parts I and II. The guidelines below are based on a scholarship level of 10%. Clinical faculty with more time devoted to scholarship should provide evidence of increased productivity. Clinical faculty with less time devoted to scholarship should be reviewed to determine if they met (Satisfactory) or exceeded (Excellent) their scholarship plan as outlined in their Annual Report, Parts I and II.

2. It is the expectation that clinical faculty will have a well-defined area of clinical expertise and will demonstrate ongoing clinical excellence through engagement in current evidenced-based or theory-based practice that contributes to the regional area and is validated by the professional community.
3. Needs improvement in scholarship denotes that the clinical faculty member did not meet departmental standards for satisfactory scholarship.
4. Satisfactory in scholarship may vary depending on the clinical faculty member's workload expectations (See D.1.). For most clinical faculty, a rating of satisfactory involves completion of each of the following during the academic year:
  - a. Submitted at least one proposal for a professional presentation at the university, local, state, regional, national, or international level (e.g., invited presentation, multi-state audience, OT Practice, campus event)
  - b. Completed continuing education activity that relates to teaching, scholarship, or service (12 Continuing Education Units required for Occupational Therapy license)
  - c. Demonstrated currency in areas of professional responsibilities and expertise, such as active engagement in clinical practice, demonstration of clinical expertise, consultation, community education, service learning or other comparable activities
5. Excellence in scholarship for most clinical faculty will involve completion of at least one of these listed scholarly products during the academic year:
  - a. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards an article or equivalent publication in a refereed or practice journal or a book.
  - b. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards the submission of a grant.
  - c. Demonstrated ongoing successful progress on an internal awarded grant (re-application for funding, implementation, evaluation).
  - d. Made a presentation at a local or regional level conference.
  - e. Provided evidence of validation of advanced or specialized practice skills, such as appropriate and related certification or credentialing, including renewal of certifications.
  - f. Provided evidence of significant efforts toward dissemination of clinical expertise via consultation, participation in clinical research, scholarship of application or integration, or participation in a grant or grant application, workshops, development of case reports or comparable activities.

#### **E. Department of OTOS Standards for Merit in Service for All Faculty**

1. Needs Improvement
  - a. The faculty member's service performance fails to meet departmental standards; did not fulfill contractual or professional expectations.
2. Satisfactory
  - a. The faculty member's service performance met the departmental service standards. The faculty member contributed positively to fulfilling the department's service goals and reflected collegiality and academic citizenship.
  - b. The faculty member met the following service performance standards with satisfactory quality:
    - i. Actively participated on at least two committees or equivalent activity (e.g., grant, workgroup) at either the departmental, college, or university levels.
    - ii. Demonstrated collegial behavior, actively facilitated achievement of department standards and goals.
3. Excellence
  - a. The faculty member's service performance was diverse and extraordinary. In addition to satisfactory performance on the service standards, the faculty member accomplished at least two of the following with high quality. These items can be repeated.
    - i. Held a key position on a department, college or university level committee, task force, or equivalent activity.
    - ii. Was actively involved in one additional service activity (beyond those for satisfactory level) that was essential to the mission of the department, college or university.
    - iii. Was a board member or held a leadership position in a professional organization or professionally related community organization.
    - iv. Was a consultant to a community organization.

**APPENDIX A**  
Towson University  
Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science

**Calendar**

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>
<b>August</b>	
<b>1st (USM mandated)</b>	<p>Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in ART Section III.D.4.a.</p> <p>Peer Evaluations scheduled for the following academic year.</p> <p>Faculty being reviewed for tenure or promotion the next year are to be highlighted as a priority.</p> <p>Committees (PTR and Merit) meet to distribute committee work and establish meeting schedule.</p>
<b>September</b>	
<b>First Friday</b>	Department chairperson approves the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department PTR Committee
<b>Third Friday</b>	Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
<b>Third Friday</b>	First-year faculty members must finalize the SENFT with the department chairperson.
<b>Fourth Friday</b>	Department chairperson notifies department faculty, Dean, and Provost of any department faculty member intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
<b>October</b>	
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department PTR and Merit committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTRM Committee if any changes have been made.
<b>Fourth Friday</b>	Department chairperson written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and five-year review added to faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member
<b>Fourth Friday</b>	Department PTR and Merit committee reports with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
<b>November</b>	
<b>Second Friday</b>	Faculty member evaluation portfolios, inclusive of department committee's written recommendation with record of vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTR chairperson to the Dean's office.
<b>December</b>	
<b>First Friday</b>	Department submits changes to the PTRM document to the college PTRM committee per the TU ART

<b>Second Friday</b>	All first-year faculty submit evaluation materials for the fall semester to the department chairperson.
<b>January</b>	
<b>Third Friday</b>	Department chair (and PTR committee if indicated) reports recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty to the faculty member and the Dean.
<b>Third Friday</b>	All documentation for the third year review of tenure track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.
<b>February</b>	
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department documents concerning Promotion, Tenure/ Reappointment, and Merit (with Approval Form signed by all current faculty) delivered to the chairperson of the University Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment, and Merit Committee <b>if any changes have been made. All changes must be indicated with track changes.</b> Track changes document and a clean copy of the documents must be submitted. Departments not electing to change their documents do not need to report.
<b>Second Friday</b>	The Provost's letter concerning contractual status has been received by first-year probationary faculty.
<b>March</b>	
<b>First Friday</b>	Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to- face feedback on their performance toward tenure
<b>First Friday</b>	For Tenure and/or Promotion: Faculty members have a 15 calendar-day appeal period. Appeals should be directed to the President.
<b>First Friday</b>	The Provost's decision concerning faculty appeals of their College Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation is delivered to the appellant. Faculty members may appeal to the President within 15 calendar days.
<b>April</b>	
	Department PTRM elections are held.
<b>May</b>	
<b>First Friday</b>	Formation of Department and College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committees. Set tentative meeting dates for September/October timeframe.
<b>June</b>	
<b>First Friday</b>	The Department chairperson may send letters to tenure-track, clinical, and visiting faculty members regarding their professional development progress. This is to coincide with developing and revising professional plans (i.e., ACOTE Form F).
<b>Third Friday</b>	Each faculty submits an evaluation portfolio including all required materials to the Department chairperson.

**APPENDIX B**  
Towson University  
Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science

**Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching**

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Class Format: \_\_\_ Hybrid \_\_\_ In-person \_\_\_ Virtual \_\_\_ Other  
 Observed: \_\_\_ In-person \_\_\_ Virtual  
 Program: \_\_\_ MS \_\_\_ ELOTD \_\_\_ PPOTD \_\_\_ ScD \_\_\_ Non-OT  
 Year in program: \_\_\_ 1st year \_\_\_ 2nd year \_\_\_ 3rd year \_\_\_ other

Based on pre-observation discussion with faculty, what are the requested focus area(s) for professional growth goals?

Instructor's experience with class: \_\_\_ first time taught \_\_\_ occasional teacher  
 \_\_\_ frequent teacher \_\_\_ course team leader

Program Considerations (Provide comments based on review of syllabus and Blackboard site):

Syllabus reviewed for consistency with approved OTOS policies, schedule and listed content support topic for observation date.  
 Specify course objectives addressed during observed class:

Blackboard course content reviewed for context and material related to observation date.

Number of students present in class: \_\_\_\_\_

Topic(s):

Narrative description:

Teaching Materials & Strategies (consider the following):

- Audio/ Visual or other technology
- Small groups
- Case-based scenarios
- Hands on/ experiential
- Other innovative techniques \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation of effectiveness (consider the following):

- Appears well prepared/ organized
- Pacing of content
- Classroom management
- Content meets objectives
- Explains ideas clearly
- Responsive interactions with students
- Engagement of students
- Integration of technology

Suggestions for Improvement, if any:

Overall Rating and Summary (see departmental criteria)

\_\_\_\_ Not Meritorious

\_\_\_\_ Satisfactory

\_\_\_\_ Excellent

Instructor comments, if any:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature and Rank of Reviewer/ date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature and Rank of Faculty being Observed/ date

Peer Eval. Form 11/30/11  
Revised: 2/26/19  
FW Committee discussion draft 3/3/21  
Faculty mtg discussion draft 4/14/21

**APPENDIX C**  
 Towson University  
 Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science  
**Student Course Evaluation for Low-Enrollment Assessment**

**Procedure for Low-Enrollment Assessment**

The University does not report course evaluation for course sections with fewer than 3 students. Because many of the courses in some of the occupational therapy and occupational science programs regularly have small enrollment (fewer than 10), students in these courses may be asked to complete the following alternate course evaluation for department-level analysis.

The standardized format below will be distributed via online survey by the department administrative assistant to all enrolled students at the request of the instructor and with approval of department chairperson. It will be timed synchronously with University evaluations (during final 2 weeks of class, closing prior to exams). The anonymous results will be returned to faculty synchronously with University evaluations, and may be included in evaluation of teaching effectiveness (Appendix D) and for narrative reflection and course improvement.

All department policies related to the course evaluation process apply when using this form for small course sections.

---

**Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science**

You are invited to complete an evaluation of this course. It will be a chance to reflect on what we have accomplished and to propose ways the course might be modified for your peers in the future.

**Quantitative items**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Course Level Items</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	
I was intellectually challenged by the course.						
I was encouraged to value different perspectives and alternative points of view in the course.						
<b>Instructor Level Items</b>						
Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter						
Was available for consultation						
Allowed class time for informal discussion and questions						
Explained course content adequately and clearly						
Promoted independent thinking and problem solving						
Gave adequate feedback, oral and/or written						
Instructor created a positive learning environment.						
Individual class periods (lectures, discussions, and activities) were well planned to optimize student learning.						

**Stop/Start/Continue** – Please reflect on aspects of the course to STOP (those that did not facilitate your learning), which to START (those that would help improve learning in the course), and which to CONTINUE (those that were effective in learning the course content)

<b>STOP</b>	<b>START</b>	<b>CONTINUE</b>

**APPENDIX D**  
 Towson University  
 Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science

**Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table**

Fall Item Median by Course					Spring Item Median by Course				Average of item medians for Academic Year
Department Selected Teaching Effectiveness Items from University Online Course Evaluation	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	OCTH/ OSC#	
6. I was encouraged to value different perspectives and alternative points of view in this course.									
9. The course was clearly organized									
11. I understood the requirements for the course									
12. Explained concepts clearly									
13. Assigned grades according to stated criteria									
14. Provided feedback on my performance as the course progressed									
15. Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter									
16. Was available for consultation									
Average course medians for Academic Year									

Average medians for Academic Year  
