Towson University
Office of Collaborative Programs
Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures
(Effective Fall 2011)

In conformity with the Towson University Faculty Handbook, the Office of Collaborative Programs Promotion, Tenure, Rank and Merit Committees administer the systems of faculty evaluation by implementing the provisions set forth in the document “Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty” (ART, August 2010). The Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs will assume the responsibilities of the Department Chair for the purposes of this academic unit.

I. Office of Collaborative Programs Committee(s) for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit

1. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee for tenured and tenure-track faculty: All tenured faculty who teach in an Office of Collaborative Programs program are eligible to serve as members of the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee. The Director of Office of Collaborative Programs will be a non-voting member. This committee is responsible for tenure, promotion, reappointment recommendations, third-year review, five-year comprehensive review, and merit decisions.

   A. Eligibility and Term:
      Academic programs within the Office of Collaborative Programs include Allied Health BTPS program, Physician Assistant Studies MS program, Clinician-Administrator Clinician (CAT) post-baccalaureate certificate program, Autism post-baccalaureate certificate program, and health track within Integrated Homeland Security Management MS program. The committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members who are associated with, have a role with, or teach courses in the academic programs contained within the Office of Collaborative Programs. They shall be appointed to a three-year term with permission by their Chairs (if home department is other than Office of Collaborative Programs). After initial three years, appointments may be staggered.

   B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair:
      Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty appointed to the committee. The chair of this committee will be elected, with nominee consent, by a vote of all tenured faculty on the second Friday of April.

   C. How alternates are chosen/vacancies filled:
      If an insufficient number of tenured faculty who meet the criteria are available, or if a member of the PTRM committee is unable to serve a full term, an eligible replacement will be appointed by the PTRM Committee Chair in consultation with the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs and with the approval of the CHP PTRM Committee. If the PTRM committee chair
is unable to serve a full term, an eligible interim chair will be appointed by the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs, with the approval of the CHP PTRM Committee.

2. Composition of the Promotion, Reappointment and Merit Committee for clinical faculty: All tenured faculty who sit on the PTRM Committee for tenured and tenure-track faculty teach in an Office of Collaborative Programs program are eligible to serve as members of the Office of Collaborative Programs PRM committee. The committee will also include one tenure-track faculty member and one clinical faculty member assigned to the Office of Collaborative Programs. The clinical faculty member must have received a minimum of three one-year contracts, and will be elected by the clinical faculty within the unit. The Director of Office of Collaborative Programs will be a non-voting member. This committee is responsible for promotion, reappointment recommendations, recommendations for multi-year contracts, and merit decisions.

   A. Election of PRM Committee Chair:
      Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty appointed to the committee. The chair of this committee will be elected, with nominee consent, by a vote of all tenured faculty on the second Friday of April.

   B. How alternates are chosen/vacancies filled:
      If an insufficient number of tenured faculty who meet the criteria are available, or if a member of the PRM committee is unable to serve a full term, an eligible replacement will be appointed by the PRM Committee Chair in consultation with the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs, and with the approval of the CHP PTRM Committee. If the PRM committee chair is unable to serve a full term, an eligible interim chair will be appointed by the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs, with the approval of the CHP PTRM Committee.

3. Policies and procedures of the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM and PRM Committees
   A. Confidentiality
      i. Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or the Office of Collaborative Programs by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

      ii. All votes regarding tenure and/or promotion, taken by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM and PRM committees, shall be by secret ballot and tallied by the respective committee chairs.

      iii. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and or promotion files until
three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

B. Definition of Quorum
   i. Quorum for the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM and PRM committees consist of at least 80% of the committee membership.
   ii. For deliberations involving clinical faculty in the PRM committee, the clinical faculty member must be present.

C. Evaluation Portfolio materials required for submission
   i. The responsibility for preparing, organizing, and submitting materials for evaluation rests with the faculty member.
   ii. Guided by the Office of Collaborative Programs, the college, and the university criteria, the faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions as s/he deems appropriate in his/her narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
   iii. In order to ensure that all material and documentation used in making recommendations contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member’s college and the Office of Collaborative Programs standards and criteria. The type of review determines both portfolio material and process.
   iv. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review.
   v. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty must include the following documents:

   1. Completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson’s Annual Report I & II) Forms;
   2. Current Curriculum vitae;
   3. Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
   4. Evaluation of teaching and advising, as appropriate, and including the following:
      a. Qualitative evaluation of teaching
      b. Student evaluations tabulated by the Office of Collaborative Programs Director or an administrative entity other than the faculty member;
      c. Grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes effect;
      d. Peer evaluation (s) of teaching
e. Narrative self-reflection of advising

5. Documentation of scholarship and service.

vi. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:

1. All materials listed above in section v from the faculty member’s date of hire or last promotion; and

2. A narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met the standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members shall describe their teaching, advising, scholarship, and service contributions in accordance with their workload agreements for the period under review.

3. The narrative statement shall be clearly written in a style that promotes an understanding of the significance of the faculty member’s contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service.

4. The narrative statement shall be no more than five pages, single spaced pages at no less than 11 point font.

vii. If at any level confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to the Office of Collaborative Programs or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

viii. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs participating in the evaluation process may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 2 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member’s performance as presented by either the faculty member in his/her evaluation portfolio or in the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs 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 September. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar (Section VI).

ix. If the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty
member’s evaluation portfolio, other than his/her evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place.

x. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but forwarded under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member’s notification shall be tracked via the PTRM document review transmittal form (see Section VII of TU ART doc). A failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

xi. Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they do so in their evaluation statements.

xii. Copies of the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs’ detailed report with recommendation are included in the evaluation portfolio as it proceeds through the process. The committee’s written report with recommendation shall provide a detailed rationale for the recommendation, as well as the vote count.

xiii. In addition to the evaluation portfolio, faculty being reviewed for promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review or a 3-year clinical faculty contract shall also prepare a summative portfolio for the Provost. It shall be clearly labeled with the faculty member’s name, the Office of Collaborative Programs, and type of review. In each section of the binder, documents shall be presented from the most recent year evaluated to the time of last promotion or year of hire. The summative portfolio shall be compiled in a one-inch binder, labeled and indexed as follows:

1. Section I
   a. Curriculum vita
   b. A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity

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

3. Section III
   a. Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using the new university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using Office of Collaborative Programs forms previously used
should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time.
b. Include a narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
c. For tenure, promotion, and comprehensive review, peer teaching evaluations shall be included.

4. Section IV
   a. Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

5. Section V
   a. Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party);
   b. Written recommendation of the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee, including the Office of Collaborative Programs Summary Recommendation form;
   c. Written recommendation of the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs;
   d. Written recommendation of the College PTRM committee;
   and
   e. Written recommendation of the academic dean.

6. Additional responsibilities
   a. The dean for the college shall assure that the summative portfolio for the Provost is organized according to the guidelines described herein.
   b. The dean of the college shall have the responsibility of returning the supporting material to the Office of Collaborative Programs Director, who shall then retain it for three (3) years following the date of the decision to grant or deny promotion or tenure. The materials shall be made available only if requested by the Provost.

D. Voting privileges of faculty on sabbatical or other leave: All faculty members on sabbatical or other leave shall have voting privileges for decisions on promotion, tenure, or reappointment. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may vote by proxy for committee leadership and committee membership. In order to vote for tenure, promotion, or merit, they must have participated in the review of materials and all discussions.

E. Procedure for evaluation of teaching by peers:
   i. Two peer reviews of teaching are required annually for all faculty in their first year and for all tenure-track faculty. One peer review of
teaching is required annually for all tenured and clinical faculty, except in the year preceding review for promotion or comprehensive five-year review.

ii. The Office of Collaborative Programs Director will select the peers for review.

iii. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.

F. Procedure for evaluation of teaching by students:
   i. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.
   ii. Tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms.
   iii. The Office of Collaborative Programs will use the online, confidential evaluation forms currently mandated by the University.

G. Procedures for Deliberation of Evaluation Portfolio and College Standards:
   i. Decisions made by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM and PRM committees are dependent on the standards and expectations for promotion, tenure and merit developed in accordance with “Appendix 3 to the Towson University ART policy” (ART, August 2010), University Standards and Expectations, and the CHP Promotion and Tenure Policy document (January 2011).
   ii. Once the committee has completed deliberations about a candidate and decided to recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, (see TU ART Appendix 3, p. 25 Section 6H & 6J), the Office of Collaborative Programs Director submits “a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM Committee’s recommendation”. The letter is included with the faculty candidate’s documents that are forwarded to the College PTRM Committee and the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM documents, including the Evaluation Record regarding the candidate, are forwarded by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee chairperson(s) to the Dean’s office in the specified format (refer to Appendix C to this document) by the second Friday in November.

H. Voting Procedures:
   i. After careful review, each committee member will vote. All decisions made by the committee must be made by a quorum; the outcome will be decided by a majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed again by the entire committee and voted on a second time. This procedure will continue until the tie vote is broken.
ii. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

iii. The committee chairs shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee’s recommendations to the next level of review.

I. Schedule and Procedures for Third-Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty:
   i. 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 intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate’s profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committees’ evaluations of a candidate’s interim progress will become part of the faculty member’s file at the Office of Collaborative Programs level and shared with the dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost.

   ii. As this constitutes the first comprehensive document for the Office of Collaborative Programs, the faculty member shall be reviewed against the criteria contained in this document, as opposed to any materials used at the time of hire.

   iii. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee as outlined in the section “Documentation and Material Inclusion” (Section I.B) of Appendix III of ART. This three-inch comprehensive portfolio is due by the third Monday in January.

   iv. The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee will evaluate the materials and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service and other relevant criteria. This statement:

       1. Must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member’s work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
       2. Must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.

   v. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
1. **Superior** progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting Office of Collaborative Programs standards in service.

2. **Satisfactory** progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the Office of Collaborative Programs. This ranking indicates that the Office of Collaborative Programs has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements are needed.

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

vi. All documentation from the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee is due to the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs by the third Friday in January.

vii. Feedback to the faculty member should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs and the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean by the third Friday in March.

viii. If a faculty member’s mandatory tenure-review year is prior to the sixth year of continuous, full-time service, the standard Annual Review by the Office of Collaborative Programs may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the Office of Collaborative Programs may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

J. Reporting to candidates in annual cycle (NOTE: third year review process follows calendar as stated above):

i. The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service.

ii. The statement with recommendation and Evaluation Record shall be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio and submitted to the dean by the third Friday in March.

iii. The recommendations of the College PTRM committee and the dean shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the first Friday in March.

iv. A copy of the decision letter concerning the promotion and/or tenure recommendation will be forwarded to the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs and the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee chair.
v. Negative recommendations regarding promotion and/or tenure shall be delivered to the faculty member’s last known address by the administrator at the appropriate level. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person or by certified mail, return-receipt-requested, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are being distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

K. Role of Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM Committee Chair: The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee chairperson shall forward the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record, to the dean’s office by the second Friday in November, where they will be available to members of the College PTRM Committee.

L. Role of the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs: The Office of Collaborative Programs Director shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

M. Comprehensive Five-Year review (Post-tenure Review):
   i. The comprehensive policies herein are in accordance with the principles established by the USM Board of Regents on 7/12/96 and shall not be construed to substitute for them.
   ii. The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
   iii. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.
   iv. The Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs, in consultation with the dean of the college shall establish the cycle for comprehensive reviews of faculty within the Office of Collaborative Programs. A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of his/her comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the dean of the college.
   v. Evaluation portfolio materials for the Five-Year Comprehensive Review are listed in Section I B 3.d.
   vi. The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM and PRM committees shall review the evaluation portfolios and shall prepare a written report, with vote count, for each recommendation. The recommendation shall contain reference to each category evaluated: teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. The statement should be
consistent with the Office of Collaborative Programs standards and expectations (stipulated in the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM document) and submitted to the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs by the second Friday in October.

vii. The Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member under review and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

viii. The faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the written recommendation of the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee, the written evaluation of the Director, and the vote count shall be forwarded by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee chair to the dean’s office by the second Friday in November.

ix. The dean of the college shall write a review with recommendation for the five-year comprehensive review by the first Friday in February. A copy of the review must be included in the evaluation portfolio submitted to the Office of the Provost.

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

xi. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any Office of Collaborative Programs Director’s statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Office of Collaborative Programs Director or sent by certified mail to the faculty member’s last known address.

xii. 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 Office of Collaborative Programs Director and the dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair, and the dean.

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

xiv. Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.
xv. If the Office of Collaborative Programs should become organized as a department, the chairperson, if a tenured faculty member, is included in the comprehensive review process.

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

N. Appeal Procedures: Promotion, Tenure, Review, Merit

i. All appeals of Office of Collaborative Programs merit decisions are reviewed by the College PTRM committee. They must be received by the Dean’s office within twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of postmark of the certified letter. The appeal should address the substantive issues that led to the denial of merit.

ii. All appeals of Office of Collaborative Programs promotion and/or tenure decisions are reviewed by the College PTRM committee. They must be received by the Dean’s office within twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of postmark of the certified letter. The appeal should address the substantive issues that lead to the denial of promotion and/or tenure.

iii. The appeal decision will be sent to the faculty member by certified mail with return receipt by the deadline published in the University’s PTRM calendar.

iv. A copy of this decision letter will be forwarded to the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs and the chair of the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee.

v. Appeals of the College PTRM committee decisions about merit, promotion and/or tenure must be submitted to the Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter.

O. Vote of Approval of this Document when New or Revised

The Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM document, when new or revised, shall be approved by a simple majority vote, via secret ballot, of all fulltime faculty members eligible for either promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit. Evidence of such review shall be submitted to the dean of the college and the university PTRM committee in accordance with the procedures and dates specified in ART III.
II. METHODS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

1. Reappointment

A. In addition to the criteria discussed below, faculty must meet standards as outlined in Appendix 3 of Towson University ART and section 3a of CHP Standards and Criterion for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

B. Possession of the appropriate degree

i. Tenure-track or tenured faculty must possess the doctoral degree. Tenure-track faculty who begin without this degree must complete it by the date listed in their initial contract.

ii. Instructors, lecturers, or clinical faculty must possess a Master’s Degree in the appropriate field, and where appropriate, certification and/or licensure in the field, clinical or professional experience in the area of discipline in which the appointment is being made, evidence of currency in professional or clinical practice, and demonstrated competence in professional/clinical teaching ability in the discipline.

C. Teaching effectiveness focused on faculty expertise and classroom management, reviewed as:

   i. Demonstration of necessary knowledge in the course content.

   ii. Demonstration of appropriate course planning and effective teaching in terms of course content, structure, instruction, and methods of student evaluation of learning.

   iii. Demonstration of effective evaluation of student learning/performace.

   iv. Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology into teaching and clinical supervision.

D. Teaching effectiveness focused on student learning, reviewed as:

   i. Creation of a climate that is conducive to learning

   ii. Respect for diversity and inclusion at a variety of levels

   iii. Use of new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of the students

   iv. Support of the learning process.

The pieces of evidence the faculty member will use to document this include student evaluations, peer evaluations (as appropriate), self-evaluation, where possible, evaluation of student learning outcomes, and the judgment related to faculty performance by evaluating bodies. An additional criterion for clinical faculty regarding teaching effectiveness: Demonstrated ability to integrate expertise in
clinical or professional practice into teaching. Note: Peer evaluation form is found in Appendix B.

E. Advising effectiveness, reviewed as:
   i. Demonstration of knowledge of all aspects of the curriculum as exhibited in presentation of the program to prospective students and currently enrolled majors.
   ii. Adherence to the TU Faculty Handbook’s policies regarding inclusion of areas to be addressed during advising.
   iii. Provision of advising sessions at least once a semester with assigned advisees and one-on-one in-depth advising sessions at least once a year.
   iv. Collaboration with the Office of Collaborative Programs Director and other appropriate faculty in addressing academic and professional behaviors demonstrated by one’s advisees.

F. Effective service to the Office of Collaborative Programs, College, University, Professions, and Community, reviewed as:
   i. Service is defined as involvement in committees and other activities of the Office of Collaborative Programs, College, University, profession(s) and community. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make continuous, collegial, and positive contributions to the Office of Collaborative Programs. In order to determine areas in which the faculty member can best serve the College and University, contributions in these areas should be determined jointly by the faculty member and the Office of Collaborative Programs Director and/or Dean.
   ii. Community-related activities are defined as those community-based activities to which a faculty member brings professional expertise. This can take the form of community training, assistance, civic engagement activities, leadership roles within professional groups, or similar endeavors. Faculty are encouraged but not required to engage in community-related activities.
   iii. Participation in professional service activities may include membership on a board or committee at the local, state or national level, holding elected office, functioning as site reviewer, consulting with areas academic programs, etc.

2. Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
   A. Reappointment of clinical faculty is contingent upon evidence of on-going
clinical excellence and program need, which may be influenced by the number of students in the program.

B. Clinical Excellence refers to demonstrated expertise in specified areas of clinical practice that support and enhance the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities. Evidence of demonstrated expertise is characterized by one or more of the following:

   i. current specialty certifications or degrees;
   ii. requests for consultation;
   iii. national reputation in identified professional activities;
   iv. publications;
   v. workshop/conference presentations;
   vi. extensive clinical teaching;
   vii. formal program development;
   viii. extensive and or focused years of clinical practice in identified area;
   ix. or other relevant criteria indicative of clinical expertise.

C. The ongoing nature of clinical excellence requires some form of clinical activity during the academic year. Clinical faculty must document their activities which exemplify the continuing nature of their clinical excellence. Specified non-academic activities may include:

   i. direct service provision;
   ii. consultation;
   iii. program development or evaluation;
   iv. supervision/mentoring;
   v. other appropriate forms of clinical activity.

D. Annual documented evidence of ongoing clinical excellence is provided by the following:

   i. 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;
   ii. the annual reflective summary must detail the 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;
   iii. supporting documents, such as publications, conference proceedings, consultative reports that demonstrate evidence of ongoing clinical excellence from the previous year must accompany the faculty member’s annual reflective summary.

E. Following a second positive review, the clinical faculty may request a review for multi-year contract.

F. By the third Friday in September after the completion of the next to the
last year of the initial three-year contract term, the faculty member submits a formal request and portfolio to be reconsidered for further multi-year contracts. These materials will be reviewed by the Office of Collaborative Programs PRM Committee for clinical faculty. If a formal request for consideration of additional multi-year contract is not received, the clinical faculty member review will be for a one-year contract term which will occur in the Office of Collaborative Programs PRM Committee for clinical faculty.

3. Departmental Merit

A faculty member shall demonstrate, consistent with his/her rank expectations, a professionally responsible level of achievement in three areas: teaching, scholarly growth, and service to the University.

The evaluation of faculty for Office of Collaborative Programs merit will be determined using the Merit Criteria guidelines found later in this document.

4. Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty must meet standards as identified in the Towson University ART document (University Standards and Expectations) and the CHP Promotion and Tenure Policy document as well as the following Office of Collaborative Programs standards for promotion.

III. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor

According to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty, 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 7 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. (See Appendix C for list of potential evidence for each area.)

Scholar-Teacher Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 6-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 60%  Scholarship = 25%-30%  Service = 10% - 15%

Teacher-Scholar Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 7-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 70%  Scholarship = 15%-20%  Service = 10%-15%

Dedicated Teacher Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 8-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 80%  Scholarship = 10%  Service = 10%
1. Standards for Teaching

In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will meet the following standards:

A. Demonstration of responsiveness to cultural and individual differences reflected in course content and learning activities.
B. Demonstration of responsiveness to the education standards of the relevant profession(s) through refinement, updating, and improvement of the course syllabi and materials.
C. Demonstration of primarily excellent peer evaluations of teaching.
D. Demonstration of effective instruction as measured by excellent teaching rating (70% of items rated agree/strongly agree) on student evaluations for each course taught. (Faculty member to provide written rationale if this standard is not met for every course, and narrative self-assessment should document progress over time.)
E. Demonstration of availability to students through various communication mechanisms, including regularly scheduled office hours, email, telephone, and other forms of communication.
F. Demonstration of a continued record of using student and peer feedback to make changes in teaching pedagogy, supervisor practices, or course design over time and/or significant efforts in developing new courses or curricula.
G. Demonstration of the use of appropriate instructional technology to support one’s teaching.

In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will meet the following student advising standards:

A. Consistent demonstration of accessibility to assist students with academic questions.
B. Consistent demonstration of being knowledgeable about departmental programs, policies, and procedures related college and/or university programs, policies, and procedures.
C. Consistent demonstration of being accurate in the advice given to students.

2. Standards for Scholarship

Scholarship expectations vary with the workload expectations of the faculty member. To be considered for promotion and/or tenure to associate professor, faculty members are expected to meet the criteria for their assigned workload. All candidates need to demonstrate a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda that reflects one or more of the Boyer Model forms of scholarship.
The forms of scholarship include: the scholarship of application, the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching as defined below.

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

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

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

D. Scholarship of Teaching – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning. (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998).

The candidate’s scholarship shall reflect the depth and breadth in agenda and focus. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the intellectual rigor, validity, dissemination, and quality of their scholarly work. (Table 1)

**Table 1.**

Scholarship Criteria for Tenure and or Promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor, and Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor

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

List A - All items can be counted more than once.

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

A. Funding awarded/sustained as Principal or Co-Investigator for external research grants or contracts with a substantive scholarship focus
B. Funding awarded for Towson University Faculty Development Research Grant (only counts for Associate/Tenure decision).
C. Author/co-author of a publication of a non-peer reviewed article, such as trade publication or professional newsletter.

3. Standards for Service

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 one’s profession.

A. 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 government structure, at program, department, college and university, or system levels.
   ii. Contributions to the institution 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.

B. 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 meet the following standard:
   i. Sustained contributions to community/metropolitan area which draw upon one’s expertise. This may include advocacy, interdisciplinary activities, or service contributions that are recognized by others in the community/metropolitan area.

C. Service to one’s profession. In addition to meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure, the faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor will meet the following standards:
   i. Sustained involvement in professional organizations and associations in one’s field at the state, regional, national, and/or international levels.
   ii. Contributions to a professional organization or association

IV. Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

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 College of Health Professions Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies, candidates for promotion to Full 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 significant professional leadership roles. (See Appendix C for list of potential evidence for each area.)

Scholar-Teacher Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 6-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 60%  Scholarship = 25%-30%  Service = 10% - 15%

Teacher-Scholar Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 7-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 70%  Scholarship = 15%-20%  Service = 10%-15%

Dedicated Teacher Faculty (tenured or tenure-track with 8-course teaching or administrative load):

- Teaching = 80%  Scholarship = 10%  Service = 10%

1. Standards for Teaching

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:

A. Demonstration of consistent excellence in teaching.
B. Demonstration of leadership in mentoring colleagues in teaching.
C. Demonstration of mentoring colleagues in effective advising.
D. Demonstration of mentoring student scholarship through effective guidance and advisement that enables students to complete their research, creative activity, and/or fellowship successfully.
E. Demonstration of the ability to evaluate the outcomes or products of student scholarship.
F. 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.
G. Demonstration of leadership in curricular development and evaluation.
H. Demonstration of contribution to accreditation and program review/approval activities.

Required evidence for demonstration of compliance with above standards:

A. A statement of one’s teaching and advising philosophy.
B. Evaluations of instruction by current students.
C. Periodic analysis and interpretations of the student’s evaluations.
D. Peer observation by faculty.
2. Standards for Scholarship
Scholarship expectations vary with the workload expectations of the faculty member. In order to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to Full Professor, candidates are expected to meet the criteria for their assigned workload and demonstrate a national reputation in their area of study. See the Scholarship Criteria Table 1 for criteria for Full Professor in each of the Boyer Model forms of scholarship. The faculty member is expected to provide leadership in mentoring colleagues in their efforts to synthesize and generate new knowledge in their field. In addition, the faculty member is expected to demonstrate integration of knowledge in one’s field, identification of critical themes, and recommendations for extending that knowledge base. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the intellectual rigor, validity, dissemination, and quality of his/her scholarly work.

3. Standards for Service
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.

A. 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:
   i. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues.
   ii. Distinction in the quality of one’s service to the institution at program, department, college and university or system levels.

B. 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:
   i. Leadership in addressing community issues in one’s field.
   ii. Distinction in the quality of one’s community service or performance.

C. 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 meet the following additional standards:
   i. Leadership in addressing important issues relevant to one’s profession. Faculty members should provide evidence of the accomplishments associated with their leadership role.
   ii. Distinction in the quality of one’s service to professional organizations.
V. Office of Collaborative Programs Merit Criteria
Criteria for Each Evaluation Component:
These expectations are based on expectations for a full-time faculty member. The following levels are used in the evaluation process:

A faculty member shall demonstrate, consistent with his/her rank expectations, a professionally responsible level of achievement in three areas: teaching, scholarly growth, and service to the University. The Academic Chairperson, when appointed, is evaluated on leadership as well as the other areas. Separate merit standards for each area are outlined below. The following categories will be used to evaluate merit within each of the three areas: “No Merit,” “Satisfactory,” and “Excellent.” Overall merit decisions will be determined as follows:

- Not Meritorious: Faculty members who receive a rating of “no merit” in any of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Performance fails to adequately meet standards (e.g. not meeting classes, not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations).
- Satisfactory (Base Merit): Faculty members who receive a rating of no less than “satisfactory” in all three areas. Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the University, College, and Office of Collaborative Programs.
- Excellent (Base + Merit): Faculty members who receive a rating of “excellent” in at least one of the three evaluation categories of teaching, scholarship or service, and at least “satisfactory” or better in the remaining categories.

1. TEACHING

Teaching expectations and review of their attainment are made on an individual basis and on their own merits, according to each faculty member’s Annual Report and Agreement on Annual Workload. Examples of suggested evidence for teaching are found in Appendix C.

A. For tenured, tenure track, and clinical faculty
   i. Not Meritorious:
      The faculty member’s teaching performance failed to meet departmental standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.
   ii. Satisfactory:
      The faculty member’s teaching performance met the departmental standards. The faculty member contributed positively to fulfilling the department’s teaching goals.

The faculty member contributed positively to fulfilling the Office of Collaborative Programs’ teaching goals by meeting the following standards for satisfactory teaching:
   1. Had satisfactory peer evaluations when appropriate to conduct.
   2. Constructively used feedback from peer evaluations when appropriate.
3. Received a rating of “agree/strongly agree” in 70% of items in each course taught/clinical practicum experience using the online course evaluation system. Item numbers are to be selected by faculty vote and averaged. If any courses are unsatisfactory, the faculty member needs to explain why and this explanation will be considered during the review. Student qualitative comments on course evaluations are generally positive, although they may include constructive comments regarding changes in instruction, assignments, or other aspects of teaching pedagogy. Faculty member must submit student course evaluation summary narrative, including both quantitative and qualitative data, that analyzes and reflects on performance, and discusses future instructional practices in response to student feedback.

4. Developed/used appropriate syllabi, handouts, exams, and assignments that are in congruence with curriculum design.

5. Appropriately updated course content to reflect changes in the profession and the curriculum. Maintained course supplies, materials, and equipment.

6. Performed appropriate and timely advising when assigned. Faculty member must submit advising summary narrative that analyzes and reflects on performance, and discusses future advising practices in response to student feedback.

7. Participated appropriately in peer mentoring.

8. Was accessible through appropriate use of office hours and other mechanisms.

9. Maintained humane, ethical, and professional behavior including boundaries with students during teaching and executing academic tasks involving grading, advising, and mentoring as well as maintained high ethical standards in relationships and all other academic situations.

10. Maintained confidentiality with student information.

iii. Excellent:

The faculty member’s performance was extraordinary. In addition to meeting the criteria for satisfactory performance, the faculty member met the following teaching performance standards:

1. Received good to excellent peer evaluations when appropriate to conduct.

2. Received a rating of “agree/strongly agree” in 80% of the items in each course/clinical practicum experience taught, with no courses rated as unsatisfactory. Item numbers are to be selected by faculty vote and averaged.

3. Provided evidence of significant accomplishments in the form of new course design, significant improvement to an existing course,
application of new technologies, new teaching strategies, or development of new material.

4. Demonstrated a willingness to take on new teaching challenges. This can be demonstrated by substantial documented efforts in one or more of the following areas:
   a) Developing curriculum for a new course,
   b) Developing curriculum for a new program or changes to a program,
   c) Revising an existing course based on student evaluations or self analysis,
   d) Creating new materials for a course using technology,

2. SCHOLARSHIP
Scholarship expectations and review of their attainment are made on an individual basis and on their own merits, according to each faculty member’s Annual Report and Agreement on Annual Workload. Examples of suggested evidence for scholarship are found in Appendix C.

A. For tenured and tenure-track faculty
   i. Not Meritorious:
      Faculty member whose performance failed to adequately meet department standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.
   ii. Satisfactory:
      Faculty member whose scholarship was acceptable and thus contributed positively to fulfilling the mission of the University, College/School, and Department. The faculty member met the following scholarship performance standards:
      1. Completed one of the following:
         a. Disseminated at least two presentations at the local or state level;
         b. Disseminated one presentation at the regional, or national level;
         c. Submitted a paper for publication;
         d. Submitted a grant proposal as either Primary Investigator or co-Primary Investigator;
         e. Demonstrated ongoing successful progress (re-application for funding, implementation, evaluation) on awarded grant
         f. Engaged in some equivalent scholarly activity (e.g., participation in grant activity)
      2. Submitted a proposal for a presentation at the state, regional or national level.
      3. Attended at least one conference/workshop that relates to courses/other professional responsibilities.
      4. Demonstrated currency in areas of professional responsibilities and expertise.
iii. Excellent:
The faculty member’s scholarship was extraordinary. In addition to the work to meet satisfactory performance in scholarship, the faculty member accomplished at least two of the following. Numbers one, two, and five below can be repeated.

1. Submitted or had an article or equivalent publication in a refereed journal or a book (e.g., chapter).
2. Demonstrated evidence of substantial contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency.
3. Was a primary presenter at a national or international conference.
4. Demonstrated extraordinary scholarship using current clinical experiences and expertise.
5. Demonstrated extraordinary scholarship in other areas in accordance with the CHP definition of scholarship. Some suggested areas include: 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.

B. For clinical faculty

i. Not Meritorious:
Faculty member whose performance failed to adequately meet department standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.

ii. Satisfactory:
The clinical faculty member met the following scholarship performance standards:

1. Made at least one dissemination activity at the university, local, state, regional national, or international level (e.g., invited presentation, multi-state audience, practice magazine, campus speaking);
2. Completed at least one continuing education activity that relates to teaching, scholarship, or service;
3. 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.

iii. Excellent:
The CHP defines clinical excellence as the following: “It is the expectation that clinical faculty will have a well-defined area of clinical expertise and will strive to achieve ongoing clinical excellence. Clinical excellence is defined as expertise that furthers the mission of a Metropolitan University through engagement in current evidenced-based or theory-based practice that
contributes to the regional area and is validated by the professional community. Teaching, scholarship, and service contributions should incorporate activities that maintain and build upon this clinical expertise/excellence.” Examples of clinical excellence include:

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

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

Other potential evidence of clinical excellence may include the following:

a. Requests from peers, professionals, or community members to share clinical knowledge and expertise in a professional forum or via consultation;

b. Implementation of a scholarship plan designed to enhance their clinical/professional development within their designated area of expertise.

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/ regional/ state level or national level.

d. Demonstrated extraordinary scholarship in other areas in accordance with the CHP definition of scholarship. Some suggested areas include: 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.

Thus, in addition to the work to meet satisfactory performance for clinical faculty in scholarship, the clinical faculty member accomplished at least one of the following:

1. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards an article or equivalent publication in a refereed or practice journal or a book;

2. Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency;

3. Was a primary presenter at a local, regional, national or international conference;

4. Provided evidence of validation of advanced or specialized practice skills, such as appropriate and related certification or credentialing;
5. Provided evidence of significant efforts toward dissemination of clinical expertise via consultation, participation in clinical research, scholarship of application or integration, or participation in a grant or grant application, workshops, development of case reports or comparable activities.

3. SERVICE

Service expectations and review of their attainment are made on an individual basis and on their own merits, according to each faculty member’s Annual Report and Agreement on Annual Workload. Examples of suggested evidence for service are found in Appendix C.

A. For tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty
   1. Not Meritorious:
      The faculty member’s service performance fails to meet Office of Collaborative Program standards; did not fulfill contractual or professional expectations.
   2. Satisfactory:
      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. The faculty member met the following service performance standards with satisfactory quality:
      1. Actively participated on at least two committees or equivalent activity (e.g., grant, workgroup) at either the departmental, college, or university levels.
      2. Was a team player, actively striving to facilitate departmental standards and to accomplish departmental goals.
   3. Excellent:
      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.
      1. Held a key position on a department, college or university level committee, task force, or equivalent activity.
      2. 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.
      3. Was a board member or held a leadership or key position (e.g., accreditation site reviewer) in a professional organization or professionally related community organization.
      4. Was a consultant to a community organization.
5. Took leadership role in substantial curriculum development efforts for new courses and or new academic program or track.
Appendix A
Office of Collaborative Programs
PTRM YEARLY ACTIVITY CALENDAR

August
- Peer Evaluations scheduled for the following academic year. Faculty being reviewed for tenure or promotion the next year are to be highlighted as a priority
- P&T Committees (Reappointment, Promotion Merit) meet to distribute committee work and establish meeting schedule

First Friday in September
- Office of Collaborative Programs Director approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee

Third Friday in September
- Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.
- Faculty notify Director of Office of Collaborative Programs of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- First year faculty members must finalize the SENFT with the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson.

Fourth Friday in September
- Office of Collaborative Programs Director notifies Office of Collaborative Programs faculty, dean, and Provost of any Office of Collaborative Programs faculty member intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.

Second Friday in October
- Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty are submitted to the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson

Fourth Friday in October
- Office of Collaborative Programs 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.
- Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee report with recommendations and vote count and the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
Second Friday in November
- Faculty member evaluation portfolios, inclusive of Office of Collaborative Programs committee’s written recommendation with record of vote count, and the written recommendation of the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson, are forwarded by the Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM chairperson to the dean’s office.

First Friday in December
- Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTRM committee if any changes have been made.

Second Friday in December
- First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson.

First Friday in January
- Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the Office of Collaborative Programs chairperson.

Third Monday in January
- Comprehensive portfolio due from faculty undergoing third year review to the Director of the Office of Collaborative Programs

Third Friday in January
- Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the faculty member and the dean.
- Office of Collaborative Programs chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

Second Friday in February
- Office of Collaborative Programs 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, if any changes have been made. All changes must be indicated with redline or strikeout. Office of Collaborative Programss not electing to change their documents do not need to report.
• The Provost’s letter concerning contractual status has been received by first-year probationary faculty.

First Friday in March
• Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.
• Regarding Tenure and/or Promotion. Faculty members have a 15-calendar day appeal period. Appeals should be directed to the President.

April
• Office of Collaborative Programs PTRM elections are held

First Friday in May
• Formation of Office of Collaborative Programs and College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committees. Set tentative meeting dates for Sept/Oct.

Third Friday in June
• All faculty submit an evaluation portfolio including the following documents to the Office of Collaborative Programs Chairperson
  ○ Faculty Annual Report (AR) Part I and II form
  ○ Current Professional Vita
  ○ Syllabus for each course taught this AY
  ○ Evaluation of teaching and advising
  ○ Other documents required in Section III.B. or desired by faculty member
Instructor:_____________________  Course:_________________  Date:____________
Time:____________

Student _______UG 1st Year _______ UG 2nd Year _______UG 3rd Year
Year

Cohort(s): _______G 1st Year _______ G 2nd Year _______ G 3rd Year

Instructor’s experience with class: ______ first time taught ______ occasional teacher
______ frequent teacher ______ team leader for course

Number of students present in class:_______

Topic:

Objectives:

Evaluation of Teaching Materials and Strategies:

Comments on Effectiveness (consider classroom climate, respect for diversity and inclusion,
support of the learning process and student learning needs):

Suggestions for Improvement, if any:
Overall Rating and Summary (see departmental criteria)

_______ Not Meritorious

_______ Satisfactory

_______ Excellent

Comments of Evaluatee:

____________________________________

Signature and Rank of Evaluator

____________________________________

Signature and Rank of Evaluatee

____________________________________

Date

Peer Eval. Form 11/02
Appendix C

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND PROFESSOR
SUGGESTED EVIDENCE FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

Teaching

The list below represents potential evidence for the faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with teaching criteria for promotion.

- A reflective review of one’s teaching philosophy
- Course syllabi
- Presentation of changes and improvements in one’s course syllabi
- Peer observations and/or other peer reviews of one’s teaching
- Evaluations of instruction by both current students and graduates
- Subjective comments of students
- Periodic analysis and interpretations of the student’s evaluations
- Student projects, products, and achievements
- Evaluations obtained by means of focus groups
- Correspondence from students, alumni, or other faculty
- Standardized tests scores or pre/post test results
- Requests to help others with their teaching
- Teaching methods, materials, and strategies published or presented
- University curriculum and instructional development grant
- Teaching awards and nominations
- Presentation of selected reports, productions, or theses completed by the students
- Presentation of subsequent publication from professional presentations by students
- Presentation of teaching methods, materials, and strategies that are published or presented
- Correspondence from faculty peers, departmental chairs, and other committee members.
- Copies of course and program proposals
- Demonstration of participation on accreditation or program approval change
- Copies of correspondence from colleagues who have participated on committees that have developed curriculum or conducted accreditation and program approval reviews

Scholarship

The list below represents potential evidence for the faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with scholarship criteria for promotion.

- A description of one’s scholarship and/or creative agenda
- Presentation of products of one’s work:
  - Juried presentations at professional conferences
  - Publications in peer reviewed journals
  - Books
  - Chapters
o Monographs
o Technical reports
o Invited presentations
o Instructional/curricular materials
o Modules
o Tests/instruments
o Equipment
o Inventions
o Conference proceedings.

- Evidence of citations by others of one’s scholarship
- Summaries of external evaluations and reviews of one’s work
- A summary of requests for reprints of one’s publications
- Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others
- Membership on editorial boards of scholarly publications
- Receipt of competitive research grant or contracts from external and internal funding sources
- Manuscripts, research proposals, artistic productions, programs, artifacts, and other products of scholarship that are submitted for publication, funding, or dissemination
- Reports of scholarship or creative projects in progress
- Awards and other recognition for the quality of one’s scholarship or creative endeavor

**Service**

The list below represents potential evidence for the faculty member to present when demonstrating compliance with service criteria for promotion.

- Membership on faculty committees
- Leadership positions in the university governance and structure
- Correspondence from colleagues and others
- Involvement in student activities, organizations, and programs
- Membership in professional organizations 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 organization that is sustained and focused and draws upon one’s professional expertise
- A description of one’s agenda for service and of how that service draws on one’s area of professional expertise
- Examples of involvement with practitioners that is distinct and focused and that draws upon one’s professional expertise
- Correspondence from leaders in professional organizations and associations in one’s field
- Provision of in-service education or technical assistance
- Professional consultation