DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE PROMOTION, TENURE, 
REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT (PTRM) DOCUMENT 
(Also referred to as “The OTOS PTRM Document”) 

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL: November 30, 2017 
DEPARTMENT REVISIONS APPROVAL: January 28, 2018 
CHP PTRM COMMITTEE APPROVAL: 
UNIVERSITY PTRM COMMITTEE APPROVAL: 
I. PTRM GENERAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
A. Calendar
B. Changes to and Approvals of the Department of OTOS PTRM Document
C. Committee Structure and Processes
D. Role of the Department Chairperson

II. EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY
A. University and College
B. Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science
C. New Faculty

III. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
A. Annual Review of ALL tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty
B. Full review for candidate for tenure and/or promotion
C. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenure Faculty
D. Merit Review

IV. METHODS/PROCESSES/PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
A. First Year Review of Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty
B. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
C. Full Review for Candidates for Tenure and Promotion
D. Comprehensive Post-Tenure Five-Year Review

V. STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
A. Reappointment
B. Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
C. Departmental Merit
D. Tenure and/or Promotion

VI. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
A. Standards for Teaching and Advising
B. Standard for Scholarship
C. Standard for Service

DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT (PTRM) DOCUMENT

Table of Contents
VII. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR ................................................................. 16
A. Standards for Teaching and Advising ................................................................. 17
B. Standards for Scholarship .............................................................................. 17
C. Standards for Service ...................................................................................... 18

VIII. DEPARTMENT OF OTOS MERIT CRITERIA .................................................................. 18

APPENDICES ................................................................................................................. 21
A. Appendix A: PTRM Yearly Activity Calendar .................................................. 22
B. Appendix B: Merit Criteria for Differentiated Scholarship Workloads ............... 25
C. Appendix C: Student Course Evaluation of OTOS Merit Consideration .............. 30
D. Appendix D: Peer Evaluation of Teaching ....................................................... 34
E. Appendix E: Peer Evaluation Policy ................................................................. 35
F. Appendix F: Suggested Evidence for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service ............ 36
G. Appendix G: Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table ....................................... 38
I. PTRM General Policies and Procedures

A. Calendar
The Towson University Promotion and Tenure calendar will be followed for all steps in the promotion and tenure process [See Towson University Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) document]. Department deadlines are in Appendix A of this document.

B. Changes to and Approvals of the Department of OTOS PTRM Document
1. Every three years, according to the schedule outlined the TU ART all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty review the Department of OTOS PTRM Document and propose any needed changes.
2. All changes to the PTRM Document must be approved by vote of all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty. Lecturers may participate in discussions related to changing the document but may not vote. Changes are approved by majority vote of eligible faculty.
3. The vote will be completed using a written individual secret ballot that includes each faculty 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 s/he has 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 by department faculty, all changes to the PTRM document will be forwarded to the CHP PTRM Committee by the second Friday in October.

C. Committee Structure and Process
1. Composition and Eligibility
The PTRM Committee is comprised of two committees: the Promotion/ Tenure/ Reappointment/ Comprehensive Review Committee (PTR), and the Merit Committee.
   a) The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Review Committee
   - The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Review Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members.
   - The Department Chairperson is a non-voting member.
   - When considering promotion or request for a multi-year contract of clinical faculty, a Clinical Associate Professor must be elected to the committee. Should an appropriate ranked faculty member not be available, a member from outside the department but within the College of Health Professions will be appointed to the committee for deliberations.
   - 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 appointed to the committee for deliberations.
• This committee completes its deliberations before the Merit Committee begins its deliberations.

b) The Merit Committee

• The Merit Committee is composed of four voting members (see below).
• The Department Chairperson is a non-voting member.
• The Committee composition will include one representative from each rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, assistant professor) and a clinical faculty member
• When there are not enough appropriately ranked faculty members available to serve, at least two tenured/tenure-track ranks will be represented.
• The criteria for serving on this committee include:
  o Tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty who have served at least three full years at the University, and
  o One clinical faculty member who has served at least three years in this capacity.

2. Selection of Committee Members, Alternates, and External Reviewers

a) The Department PTRM chairperson, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Department of OTOS, will hold an election to determine the members of the Merit committee according to the Towson University ART calendar.

b) In April of each year, a ballot will be formed that meets department criteria, and an election will be held for the Merit (annual) Committees.

c) All PTRM committees will be formed by the first Friday in May.

d) The members, including an alternate member, of the Merit committee is elected by tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty. The faculty member receiving the next highest vote after the top elected members have been selected will be elected as the alternate. The alternate will serve when a committee member cannot serve. These procedures are consistent with the CHP PTRM document.

e) At the request of an individual faculty member, a faculty member from another department may be added to the PTR and/or Merit committee for the purpose of review of the faculty member for promotion, comprehensive five-year review and/or merit. Request for an additional committee member must be made at the time of submission of the documents (third Friday in June). The appropriate department committee must approve the additional member.

f) Term of Office: For all committees, terms will be for one year.

3. Confidentiality

Members of the Department PTRM committee(s) must regard their work to be of the utmost confidentiality. Any discussion of matters that come before a committee with anyone not on the committee, or discussions of these matters in public areas or in unofficial meetings, is inappropriate, except to the extent such disclosure is required by law or applicable policy. Any and all such behavior shall be regarded as a serious breach of confidentiality and shall be subject to disciplinary action. All actions of the Department PTRM committee(s) including discussions and processes will be kept confidential.
4. Committee Procedures for Deliberations and Reporting to Candidates
   a) The Committee members review the documents to determine achievements of standards and criteria. Alternate members will serve as needed. A quorum shall be a simple majority of the voting members.
   b) A positive or negative recommendation for PTRM is decided by majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the committee will continue deliberations until a majority positive or negative recommendation is reached.
   c) The PTRM chairperson records and dates the result of the vote on the faculty member’s Department Summary Recommendation Form (DSR).
   d) The Committee members or individual designee will write a report indicating the recommendation regarding PTRM status.
   e) All Committee members sign the report indicating that they have read it.
   f) The Committee(s)’ recommendations are given to all non-first year faculty by the second Friday in October.
   g) The faculty members being evaluated shall sign the final report and the DSR form indicating that they have read both.
   h) The department chairperson or designee shall send the signed and dated report to the Dean’s office. In addition, the DSR form and either the Annual Report Parts I & II (AR) or the Chairperson’s Annual Report I & II (CAR) form, as well as other supporting materials, will be forwarded according to the University ART calendar.
5. Voting Procedures
   a) All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive review taken by any committee will be by individual secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the PTRM committee chair. During the voting process, the department chairperson (non-voting member) will check the ballots to identify any cases of a tie vote before deliberations are concluded for that faculty member. The PTRM committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the final result of the vote and the committee’s recommendation to the next level of review. The secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the faculty member’s file until three (3) years following the faculty member’s termination or resignation from the university. 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.
   b) Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may vote by proxy for committee leadership and committee membership.
   c) In order to vote for promotion, tenure, reappointment, merit, or comprehensive review, committee members must have participated in the review of materials and be physically present for all discussions and the vote.
6. Appeals of Negative Recommendations at the Department Level
   a) The faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment, tenure, promotion or merit negative recommendation.
b) The faculty member has 21 calendar days from the date of receipt of any merit, tenure, or promotion decision to appeal that decision.

c) The appeal should address the substantive issues that led to the negative recommendation.

d) The faculty member should follow procedures outlined in CHP Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures and in the Towson University ART documents.

e) Procedural Appeals

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

i. Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM committee.

ii. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered by certified mail or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

iii. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTRM chair, the dean and the university PTRM committee chair.

iv. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the university PTRM committee shall review the case and provide a written response. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.

v. Recommendations of the university PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the university PTRM committee will monitor the appeal process.

f) Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 —Prohibiting Discrimination

7. Role of Committee Chairperson

- The Committee chairperson is elected each year by majority vote of the members of the PTRM Committee at the first meeting of the academic year.

- The committee chairperson is responsible for:
  o Guiding the PTRM process to ensure that it follows the policies and procedures outlined in this document.
  a. Chairing all meetings, completing all appropriate documentation, and securing all necessary signatures.

D. Role of the Department Chairperson

1. The chairperson is a non-voting member of all PTRM committees. The department chairpersons do not serve as committee chairpersons.

2. Consistent with his/her 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 may submit a separate letter related to faculty member’s application for merit and reappointment review.

5. The Department chairperson shall submit a separate letter related to each faculty member’s application for tenure, promotion, and comprehensive five-year review.

6. The Department Chairperson must make the faculty member aware of any information included in the letter.

7. A chairperson who leaves that role at the end of the year will prepare summary documents for each faculty member who is eligible for tenure, promotion, and five-year review.

8. A chairperson who leaves that role at the end of the year may prepare summary documents for each faculty who is eligible for merit and reappointment review.

II. Expectations for Faculty

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

A. University and College

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:

1. A faculty member is committed to collegiality and academic citizenship, demonstrating high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior.

2. A faculty member is primarily concerned with excellence in teaching.

3. A faculty member meets classes as scheduled and is available for advising and consultation through office hours.
4. A faculty member supports the mission, strategic plan, and programs of the department, college, and university.

5. A faculty member is committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and is committed to continuing professional development and scholarly growth.

6. A faculty member shares the responsibility of university governance and participates each year in the faculty evaluation process.

7. A tenure-track faculty member must hold a research doctorate from an accredited institution.

B. Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science

1. All faculty members who are occupational therapists 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.

2. 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.

3. All faculty members participate in scholarly activity as outlined in the University 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 her/his 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. The department acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship as defined by the Boyer Model (Boyer, 1990). These forms include:
   a) Scholarship of Application – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.
   b) Scholarship of Discovery – conducting traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.
   c) Scholarship of Integration – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
   d) Scholarship of Teaching – exploring the dynamic endeavor involving all the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning. (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998).

4. All faculty members participate in departmental activities including course planning, course and curriculum implementation, and course related grievance and appeal procedures.

5. All faculty members adhere to ethical principles in all teaching, advising, scholarship and service activities.
6. 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 principal 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, 02-1.25).

C. New faculty will receive a Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure
   Track Faculty (SENTF) which must include:
   1. Towson University and CHP criteria for merit, reappointment, tenure, and
      promotion.
   2. Expectations which are unique to the department, which may exceed the Board of
      Regents’ and Towson University’s expectations.
   3. Expectations which are unique to the position to which the person is appointed.

III. MATERIALS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
    In accordance with University policy, the faculty member is responsible for preparing,
    organizing, and submitting materials for evaluation for

    • Annual review
    • First year review
    • Third-year review
    • Five-year comprehensive review
    • Reappointment
    • Promotion
    • Tenure
    • Multi-year contract for clinical faculty.

    The faculty member is responsible for making distinctions between the various categories
    of teaching, scholarship, and service activities as s/he deems appropriate in narrative
    statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.

    Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a one-inch three ring
    binder or submitted as a comparably organized electronic portfolio. Contents of the
    evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review.

    Supplemental binders or an electronic dossier are required for each type of review, and
    should include syllabi or all courses taught during the period under review, as well as
    documentation and support for all 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.
Materials for Submission According to Type of Review:

A. Annual review of ALL regular non-adjunct faculty
   1. Current Curriculum Vitae
   2. Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) Parts I & II, or Chairperson Annual Report
      (CAR) Parts I & II
   3. Evaluation of teaching and advising to include the following:
      a) Student course evaluations administered and tabulated through the University
         Assessment Office.
      b) Grade distributions for courses beginning with the year this document takes
         effect.
      c) Peer evaluations, if available.
      d) Advisor evaluation, if available.
   4. Narrative self-assessment of teaching and advising, integrating content from items
      above, as well as other teaching evidence in a maximum of two single-spaced pages
   5. Summary of scholarship activity and accomplishments not to exceed one single-
      spaced page.
   6. Summary of service activities not to exceed one single-spaced page.
   7. Department recommendation letters and a written report on the candidate’s
      progress toward tenure for tenure-track faculty. These documents are added to the
      one-inch binder after all Department PTRM reviews are completed.
   8. Documentation of teaching, scholarship, and service. These items, along with syllabi
      of courses taught during the year under review, are to be placed in a supplemental
      binder or electronic dossier.

B. Full review for candidate for tenure and/or promotion
   A critical part of the portfolio shall be a narrative statement (maximum of five pages
   single spaced and minimum of 11 point font) in which the candidate describes how he or
   she has met and integrated the teaching, scholarship and service standards and criteria
   for tenure and/or promotion. All materials listed above in III.A from the candidate’s date
   of hire or last promotion must also be included, from most to least recent. Solicited
   external reviews may be included in the evaluation portfolio by individual faculty request
   or by request of the Department of OTOS PTRM Committee.

C. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty
   Once every five years, the annual review shall be replaced by a comprehensive five-year
   review for tenured faculty members. A critical part of the portfolio shall be a narrative
   statement (maximum of five pages single spaces and a minimum of 11 point font) in
   which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated the teaching,
   scholarship, and service expectations for five year review. All materials listed above in
   III.A from the date of the last promotion or five-year review must be included, from
   most recent to least recent. In addition, documentation of teaching must include a grid
   depicting quantitative student course evaluations for the period under review. A goal
   statement for the next five years must also be included.
D. Merit Review
Merit review shall be concurrent with annual review. All faculty shall submit additional
documentation for merit review, including the Merit Criteria for Differentiated
Scholarship Worksheet (Appendix B) outlining the ways in which s/he has met or
exceeded the criteria for satisfactory and/or excellent merit in teaching, advising,
scholarship and service.

IV. Methods/Processes/Procedures for Faculty Evaluation
All documents are submitted to the Department Chairperson according to the
Department of OTOS Calendar (Appendix A) and the TU ART Document calendar.

A. First Year Review of Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty
1. Purpose of Review: The intention of the evaluation is to assess the faculty
member’s potential to meet department expectations for teaching, scholarship,
and service. At the conclusion of the Fall semester of the faculty member’s first
year at Towson University, the faculty member will assemble materials from her/his
activities and accomplishments during that first semester
2. Dimensions of Review: Faculty members will be evaluated on teaching, scholarship
and service as outlined in II.B – Department of OTOS Expectations.
3. Annual Review materials are provided as indicated above III.A and submitted to the
Department Chairperson by the second Friday in December. Course evaluation data
are added to the portfolio once it becomes available, and no later than the first
Friday in January.
4. Procedures and Standards: The Department of OTOS PTRM Committee will assess
the materials to determine the candidate’s ability to meet department expectations
for teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty member will be provided with a
written summary from the committee indicating satisfactory or unsatisfactory
performance.

B. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty
The Department of OTOS PTRM Committee shall conduct a Third Year Review following
the fall semester of a tenure-track faculty member’s third year at Towson University,
consistent with the Towson University ART calendar. The Department of OTOS PTRM
Committee shall follow Towson University’s 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.
1. Purpose of Review. The intention of the evaluation is to assess and support
progress toward tenure, including identification of and feedback regarding
strengths and areas of improvement noted in the faculty member’s profile.
2. Dimensions of Review. Faculty members will be evaluated on teaching, scholarship
and service as outlined in II.B – Department of OTOS Expectations.
3. 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.
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.

4. Procedure. The Department of OTOS PTRM Committee will evaluate the materials and indicate to the faculty member in writing a specific assessment of the current trajectory toward a positive tenure and promotion decision, as well as suggestions to strengthen the future portfolio. This written report will become part of the faculty member’s file at the department level and will be forwarded to the Dean.

5. Standards. Tenure-track faculty must demonstrate (a) excellence in teaching (including advising and mentoring) and have (b) a plan for and evidence of scholarly productivity. Service activities within different levels of the university and the community are expected. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
   a) Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching (in all its components, including advising), significant accomplishments in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
   b) Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This essentially means that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory but improvements may be needed.
   c) Not satisfactory progress. This evaluation requires change by the faculty member across one or more dimensions. This essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.

6. Timetable. For purposes of review during a faculty’s third year:
   a) All documentation is due to the chair of the Department PTRM Committee by the third Friday in January.
   b) Feedback will be provided both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the Department PTRM Chair no later than the first Friday in March. The letter will be forwarded to the Dean.

7. Accelerated 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.

C. Full Review for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty requesting consideration for promotion and tenure must do so in accordance with the TU ART calendar.

1. Tenure Process
   a) Assistant Professors requesting tenure must also request promotion to Associate Professor at the same time, in accordance with the ART calendar.
   b) Recommendation for tenure originates in the Department Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Review 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 Chapter III
in the Towson University Guidelines for Development of Departmental
Standards and Expectations as stated in the Towson University ART, and
Section IV of the CHP PTRM documents.

d) The guidelines for the Department’s actions regarding tenure are those set
forth under Chapter 2 Faculty Ranks Used at Towson University in the Towson
University ART document.

2. Promotion Process

a) The Promotion/Tenure/Reappointment/Comprehensive Review Committee
will review requests and materials for promotion.

b) Promotion decisions will be based on performance in the areas specified under
Chapter III.4 in the Towson University Guidelines for Development of
Departmental Standards and Expectations as stated in the Towson University
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 Chapter 2 Faculty Ranks Used at
Towson University in the Towson University 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.

3. External Review

a) The candidate for tenure or promotion may request, but is not obligated to
require, an external review of scholarship accomplishments for any level
EXCEPT promotion to professor. For promotion to professor an external
review is required. The candidate must follow the procedures outlined in the
CHP PTRM Document.

b) External reviews are confidential and not available to the candidate under
review and are not included in candidate portfolios. They will be forwarded
under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.

c) Evaluators will be independent and impartial. Evaluators cannot be from
Towson University or a former or current adviser or mentor. Each evaluator
must be identified as a scholar or expert in the faculty member’s area of
specialization and from a peer institution.

d) The Department Chairperson or designee will select at least five evaluators of
those recommended by the candidate who meet the criteria and will select an
additional five other evaluators so that a minimum of 10 evaluators are
identified as potential evaluators by February 1.

e) The Department Chairperson or designee contacts and formally confirms the
external evaluator(s) by the May 1 of the year in review using the letter
template provided in the CHP PTRM Document. External evaluators are not to
evaluate the candidate’s teaching, advising or service to the University. The external evaluation will address the Candidate’s scholarly and/or creative work as it relates to the Candidate’s promotion or tenure. Material provided to external evaluators should include the scholarly and/or creative work relative to occupational therapy and/or occupational science such as books, articles, grant proposals, computer programs, visual works or performance reviews. Materials for review including the candidate’s curriculum vitae, candidate’s narrative, and the department’s scholarship promotion criteria must be forwarded to the external reviewer(s) by July 1.

f) Department chair or designee follows any additional university procedures for external review.

D. Comprehensive Post-Tenure Five-Year Review

1. Purpose of Review. All tenured faculty participate in a comprehensive review at least once every five years to assess performance over time and provide an opportunity to establish a profession plan to serve as a basis for the next comprehensive review.

2. Dimensions of Review. Faculty will be evaluated on teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.

3. Materials. Annual Review portfolio materials noted above will be reviewed. Faculty will also submit a narrative reflective summary as noted in III.B.

4. Standards. The faculty member is evaluated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on a review of performance and accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service across the five-year span. Faculty who receive an unsatisfactory review will be required to create an appropriate plan for professional development, which must be completed by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the review occurred. The Department Chairperson, the CHP Dean, and the Provost must approve the professional development plan in writing. Faculty will undergo a comprehensive review at least once during a period up to five years.

5. Procedure. The schedule for comprehensive review is determined by date of hire or previous review. Review for purposes of promotion satisfy the requirements for comprehensive review. Request for an additional Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review committee member or external reviewer must be made at the time of submission of the documents following procedures outlined earlier. The department will follow the procedure for comprehensive review as outlined in the Towson University Faculty Handbook (see Five Year Review). Two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews will warrant an automatic comprehensive review.

Standards for Faculty Evaluation

A. Reappointment

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

2. Teaching effectiveness review based on student and peer evaluations, syllabi, and other teaching materials that reflect:
a) Demonstration of necessary knowledge in the course content.
b) Demonstration of appropriate course planning and effective teaching in terms
   of course content, structure, instruction, and methods of student evaluation
   of learning.
c) Demonstration of effective evaluation of student learning/performance.

3. Teaching effectiveness focused on student learning, reviewed as:
   a) Creation of a climate that is conducive to learning.
   b) Respect for diversity and inclusion at a variety of levels.
   c) Use of new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course
      content and learning needs of the students.
   d) Support of the learning process.

4. Advising effectiveness, reviewed as:
   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. Effective scholarship shall be determined by the faculty member’s ability to
   meet workload expectations for scholarship commensurate with the faculty
   member’s position and rank.

6. Effective service shall be reviewed as service to the Department, College, and
   University.
   a) Service is defined as involvement in committees and other activities of the
      Department, College, and University. It is the responsibility of the faculty
      member to make continuous, collegial, and positive contributions to the
      Department. 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 Department Chairperson
      and/or Dean.
   b) Community-related activities are defined as those community-based activities
      to which a faculty member brings professional expertise. Faculty are
      encouraged, but not required, to engage in community-related activities.

B. Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
   1. In addition to the criteria in section A Reappointment (above), Clinical faculty
      must meet standards as outlined in this section.
2. Reappointment of clinical faculty is contingent upon evidence of ongoing clinical excellence and departmental need, which may be influenced by the number of students in the program.

3. 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:
   a) Current specialty certifications or degrees.
   b) Requests for consultation.
   c) National reputation in identified professional activities.
   d) Publications.
   e) Workshop/conference presentations.
   f) Extensive clinical teaching.
   g) Formal program development
   h) Extensive and/or focused years of clinical practice in identified area.
   i) Other relevant criteria indicative of clinical expertise.

4. 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:
   a) Direct service provision.
   b) Consultation.
   c) Program development or evaluation.
   d) Supervision/mentoring.
   e) Other appropriate forms of clinical activity

5. Annual documented evidence of ongoing clinical excellence is provided by the following:
   a) 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.
   b) 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.
   c) 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 reflective summary.

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

7. 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. 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.

C. Departmental Merit
A faculty member shall demonstrate, consistent with her/his rank expectations, a professionally responsible level of achievement in three areas: teaching, scholarly growth, and service to the University. The Academic Chairperson is evaluated on leadership as well as these areas.

The evaluation of faculty for departmental merit will be determined using the Merit Criteria guidelines in Section VIII of this document.

D. 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 Department standards for promotion.

V. Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor
According to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (see TU Art Department), 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 Clinical Faculty PRM document, Section VII. Promotion Recommendations.

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

1. Demonstration of responsiveness to cultural and individual differences reflected in course content and learning activities.
2. Demonstration of responsiveness to the education standards of the profession through refinement, updating, and improvement of the course syllabi and materials.
3. Demonstration of primarily excellent peer evaluations of teaching.
4. Demonstration of effective instruction as measured by excellent teaching rating (80% of items rated agree/strongly agree) on student evaluations for each course taught.
5. Demonstration of availability to students through various communication mechanisms, including regularly scheduled office hours, email, telephone, and other forms of communication.
6. 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.
B. Standards for Scholarship

1. Demonstration of the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in her/his area of specialty.

2. Demonstration of a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda that reflects one or more of the Boyer Model forms of scholarship. The candidate’s scholarship shall reflect evolving depth and breadth in agenda and focus.

3. 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.

C. 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 to one’s profession.

1. 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:
   a) Involvement in the university’s faculty government structure at program, department, college and university, or system levels.
   b) Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one’s professional expertise.
   c) Advocacy in addressing important department and college issues.
   d) Recognition of the qualities and the impact of one’s service.

2. 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:
   a) 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.

3. 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:
   a) Sustained involvement in professional organizations and associations in one’s field at the state, regional, national, and/or international levels.
   b) Contributions to a professional organization or association

VI. Standards for Promotion to 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 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 Clinical Faculty PRM document, Section VII.
Promotion Recommendations.

A. Standards for Teaching and Advising
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:
1. Demonstration of consistent excellence in teaching.
2. Demonstration of leadership in mentoring colleagues in teaching.
3. Demonstration of mentoring colleagues in effective advising.
4. Demonstration of mentoring student scholarship through effective guidance and
   advisement that enables students to complete their research, creative activity,
   and/or fellowship successfully.
5. Demonstration of the ability to evaluate the outcomes or products of student
   scholarship.
6. 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.
   a) Demonstration of leadership in curricular development and evaluation.
   b) Demonstration of contribution to accreditation and program review/
      approval activities.
7. 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.

B. Standards for Scholarship
In addition to continuing to having met the scholarship standards since promotion to
associate professor the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet
the following standards:
1. Demonstration of a clear and substantial scholarship agenda with a record of
   sustained outcomes that have a substantial impact on their field of study.
2. 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.

3. Demonstration of substantive mentoring of colleagues and/or graduate students
in their scholarship activities.

4. Letters of evaluation from external reviewers, which will be solicited from outside
the University pursuant to the Guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate

C. 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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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:
   a) Leadership in addressing important issues relevant to one’s profession.

VII. Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science Merit Criteria

A. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Faculty member whose performance failed to adequately meet explicit standards (e.g., not meeting classes, not fulfilling other contractual or professional expectations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Faculty member whose work is deemed satisfactory as outlined below in each area of teaching, scholarship, and service and thus contributes positively to fulfilling the mission of the University, College/School, and Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excellent Faculty members who excel in at least one of the dimensions of teaching, scholarship or service and perform at least satisfactorily in other areas.

(Base + merit)

TEACHING

For all faculty

Needs Improvement The faculty member’s teaching performance failed to meet departmental standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.

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 met the following teaching performance standards:

- Received at least satisfactory for all peer evaluations when appropriate to conduct.
- Constructively used feedback from peer evaluations when appropriate.
- For student course evaluations, the faculty member achieved a 3.00 average of all medians across all courses taught for items identified by the department to be used for PTRM purposes. (See Appendix E Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table for calculation.)
- Developed/used appropriate syllabi, handouts, exams, and assignments that are in congruence with curriculum design.
- Appropriately updated course content to reflect changes in the profession and the curriculum. Maintained course supplies, materials, and equipment.
- Performed appropriate and timely advising when assigned.
- Participated appropriately in peer mentoring.
- Was accessible through appropriate use of office hours and other mechanisms.
- 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.
- Maintained confidentiality with student information.
Excellent

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:

- Received at least one excellent peer evaluation when appropriate or requested to conduct.
- For student course evaluations, the faculty member achieved a 4.00 average of all medians across all courses taught for items identified by the department to be used for PTRM purposes. (See Appendix E Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table for calculation.)
- 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.
- Developed or co-developed a new course which has been approved by the college curriculum committee.
- Instrumental in University related curriculum assessment/development or outcome evaluation.
- 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.
- Mentored a faculty member who wishes to further develop his/her teaching effectiveness through regular meetings, review of Blackboard sites, course materials, and class observations.

SCHOLARSHIP

For all faculty

Please see grids for merit criteria for scholarship based on workload in Appendix B.

SERVICE

For all faculty

Needs Improvement

The faculty member’s service performance fails to meet departmental standards; did not fulfill contractual or professional expectations.

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:

- Actively participated on at least two committees or equivalent activity (e.g., grant, workgroup) at either the departmental, college, or university levels.
- Demonstrated collegial behavior, actively facilitated achievement of departmental standards and goals.

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.

- Held a key position on a department, college or university level committee, task force, or equivalent activity.
- 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.
- Was a board member or held a leadership position in a professional organization or professionally related community organization.
- Was a consultant to a community organization.
Appendix A

Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science

PTRM YEARLY ACTIVITY CALENDAR

August

August 1 (USM mandated) Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member’s appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in ART Section III.D.4.a.

- 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.

Third Friday in September

- Faculty notify department chair 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 department chairperson.

Fourth Friday in September

- 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.

Second Friday in October

- Department PTRM committee’s reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
- Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTRM Committee if any changes have been made.

Fourth Friday in October

- 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.
• Department PTRM committee report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson’s evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

Second Friday in November

• 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 PTRM chairperson to the Dean’s office.

Second Friday in December

• First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the fall semester to the department chairperson.

First Friday in January

• Department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.

Third Friday in January

• Department PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the faculty member and the Dean.

• All documentation for the third year review of tenure track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.

• Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio.

Second Friday in February

• 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 if any changes have been made. All changes must be indicated with track changes. 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.

• 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.
• For Tenure and/or Promotion: Faculty members have a 15 calendar-day appeal period. Appeals should be directed to the President.

• 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.

April

• Department PTRM elections are held.

First Friday in May

• Formation of Department and College Promotion, Tenure/Reappointment and Merit Committees. Set tentative meeting dates for September/October timeframe.

First Friday in June

• 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).

Third Friday in June

• Each faculty submits an evaluation portfolio including the following documents to the department chairperson:
  o Faculty Annual Report (AR) Part I and II form.
  o Current Professional Vitae.
  o Syllabus for each course taught this AY.
  o Evaluation of teaching and advising.
  o Other documents required in Section III.A or desired by faculty member.
**Appendix B**

Towson University

Department of Occupational Therapy and Occupational Science

**Merit Criteria for Differentiated Scholarship Workloads**

**Scholarship Merit Requirements (tenured and tenure-track faculty)**

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Faculty member whose performance failed to adequately meet department standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.

SATISFACTORY CRITERIA – must meet all criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All criteria must be met for the following four items</td>
<td>All criteria must be met for the following four items</td>
<td>All criteria must be met for the following four items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Disseminated at least one presentation at the local, state, regional, or national level.
- Submitted a proposal for a presentation at the state, regional or national level.
- Attended at least one conference/workshop that relates to courses/other professional responsibilities.
- Demonstrated currency in areas of professional responsibilities and expertise.

In addition to the above, **two** of the following:

In addition to the above, **one** of the following:

Faculty with 10% Scholarship are not required to meet this category for satisfactory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted a paper for publication.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted an internal grant proposal as either Primary Investigator or co-Primary Investigator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated ongoing successful progress on awarded grant (re-application for funding, implementation, evaluation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in some equivalent scholarly activity (e.g., participation in grant activity).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted a book chapter or revisions to a subsequent chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published in a non-peer reviewed periodical (e.g., OT Practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a curricular module (e.g., CD, DVDs, FAQs, brief report, position paper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 EXCELLENT CRITERIA – must meet criteria for satisfactory and the specified criteria for the appropriate workload expectation level. Multiple items may be submitted for items marked with an asterisk (*)

Tenured or Tenure-track Faculty with Scholarship Workload Expectations of 30% or 20% must meet the following additional criteria for excellence in scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two of the following</td>
<td>One of the following</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Had a publication in a refereed journal or book (e.g., chapter as lead author). (*)

Edited a book.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured or Tenure-track Faculty with Scholarship Workload Expectations of 10% must meet the following additional criteria for excellence in scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10%</th>
<th>One of the following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted or had a co-authored article or equivalent publication in a refereed journal or a book (e.g., chapter). *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated evidence of substantial contribution towards the submission of a grant to an external agency with evidence of individual contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a co-presenter at a national or international conference (including IPE). *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of substantial contribution towards a research project with evidence of personal contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated extraordinary scholarship using current clinical experiences and expertise. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other extraordinary scholarship (e.g., research, scholarly engagement and dissemination relative to grant activity; evidence of grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administration, implementation and/or evaluation; grant review, development of workshops/programs, peer review for refereed publications; administrative scholarship

1 Scholarship Merit Requirement (Clinical faculty)

2 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Faculty member whose performance failed to adequately meet department standards; not fulfilling contractual or professional expectations.

4 Satisfactory Criteria – must meet all criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted at least one proposal for a professional presentation at the university, local, state, regional national, or international level (e.g., invited presentation, multistate audience, OT Practice, campus event).</td>
<td>University Local State</td>
<td>University Local State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed continuing education activity that relates to teaching, scholarship, or service.</td>
<td>12 Continuing Education Units required for Occupational Therapy license</td>
<td>12 Continuing Education Units required for Occupational Therapy license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Demonstration of consultation or comparable activity</td>
<td>Demonstration of clinical expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Clinical excellence is defined by the CHP 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.
EXCELLENT CRITERIA – must meet criteria for Satisfactory and 1 of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards an article or equivalent publication in a refereed or practice journal or a book.</td>
<td>Contribution category: Peer-reviewed Research Invited</td>
<td>Contribution category: Practice journal or book Practice level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated evidence of contribution towards the submission of a grant.</td>
<td>External grant</td>
<td>Internal grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated ongoing successful progress on an awarded grant (re-application for funding, implementation, evaluation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a presentation at a local, regional, national or international conference.</td>
<td>National Regional State Local</td>
<td>Local State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided evidence of validation of advanced or specialized practice skills, such as appropriate and related certification or credentialing.</td>
<td>First time certification</td>
<td>Renewal of certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Consultation Clinical research Grant participation</td>
<td>Application Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Student Online Course Evaluation for OTOS Merit Consideration

1. Eight items from the student course evaluations (#s 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16) are used for calculating the median scores.
2. For consideration of a “satisfactory” teaching rating, faculty member must have a minimum median of 3.00 rating for the average of all regular courses taught.
3. For consideration of an “excellent” teaching rating, faculty member must have a minimum median of 4.00 rating for the average of all regular courses taught.
4. Faculty may include data for offload courses.
5. 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.
6. Faculty may include data obtained in a systematic manner related to course evaluation by students.
7. There may be extenuating circumstances in which a particular course will not be included in the merit calculation. 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. OCTH 628 or OCTH 781 offered in minimester in which students are given an “incomplete.”
   d. Courses in which there are four or less students or courses in which less than 50% of students respond to the online course evaluation.
   e. New course or new course format – only one course may be excluded one time.

Student Self-Assessment

1. What was the main reason you enrolled in this course? (select the two most important)
   - 0 It was a requirement for the major or the program
   - 0 It fulfilled a Gen. Ed. requirement
   - 0 It provided me with professional development or career training
   - 0 It fit my schedule
   - 0 Someone recommended the course or the instructor
   - 0 I was interested in the topic
   - 0 Other

2. What is your attendance record for this course?
   - 0 Never miss a class
   - 0 Missed 1 or 2 classes
   - 0 Missed 3 or 4 classes
   - 0 Missed 5 or more classes
   - 0 Not applicable, online
   - 0 Not applicable, other
   - 0 No response
3. Approximately how many hours per week, in addition to your class session (traditional or online), do you spend preparing for this course?
   - Less than 1 hour
   - 1 - 2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
   - 5-6 hours
   - 7 or more hours
   - No response

4. What grade do you expect in this course?
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F
   - Other
   - No response

5. I was intellectually challenged by the course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - No Response
   - Not Applicable

6. I was encouraged to value different perspectives and alternative points of view in the course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Not Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Course learning objectives were clearly described in the syllabus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assignments/tests reflected the primary content of this course as set out in the course learning objectives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The course was clearly organized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Course learning objectives were met</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I understood the requirements for course grading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Explained concepts clearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Assigned grades according to stated criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Provided feedback on my performance as the course progressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Demonstrated knowledge about course subject matter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Was available for consultation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Encouraged me to do my best</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson Mission Driven Questions</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Overall, cost of text and other required materials were appropriate to the course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 The text and other required materials were necessary for successful completion of the course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 This course required me to use technology (blackboard, on-line instruction, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 a. Overall, the technologies used greatly facilitated my learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Open Ended Questions
2. 22. What do you like about this course?
23. What could be improved about this course?

24. Would you recommend this class to others? Why or why not?
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TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY & OCCUPATIONAL SCIENCE

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Instructor: __________ Course: __________ Date: __________ Time: __________

Class: _______UG 1st year _______UG 2nd year _______UG 3rd year

Level: _______G 1st year _______G 2nd year _______G 3rd year

Student: _______ Combined BS/MS

Cohort(s): _______ Professional MS

_________ Doctoral

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: __________

Suggestions for Improvement, if any: __________

Overall Rating and Summary (see departmental criteria)

____ Needs Improvement

____ Satisfactory

____ Excellent

Comments of Evaluatee: __________

________________________________________________________________________

Signature and Rank of Evaluator

_________________________________

Signature and Rank of Evaluatee

________________________________________________________________________

Date
Appendix E

Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science

Peer Evaluation Policy

Policy

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.

Procedures

1. By August 31 of the academic year, the department chairperson develops a list of faculty for peer observation and makes assignments.

2. 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 evaluator and the evaluatee to schedule the observation in a timely manner that allows for feedback to be incorporated into course delivery.

3. The date of observation will be determined at least one week in advance of the scheduled evaluation unless that interval is mutually waived.

4. Prior to the observation, the faculty evaluator 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.

5. The period of observation must be at least 50 minutes.

6. Following the observation, the faculty evaluator will complete the evaluation form, 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.

7. Following this discussion, the peer evaluation form is signed by both the evaluator and evaluatee with the original going to the department chairperson, placed in the designated folder and a copy to the evaluatee for his/her annual review materials. The chairperson emails the evaluatee and evaluator when he/she receives and logs the receipt of the peer evaluation.

8. Unsatisfactory peer evaluations will be addressed administratively by the department chairperson and faculty evaluatee.
Appendix F

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(s) 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
Monographs
Technical reports
Invited presentations
Instructional/curricular materials
Modules
Tests/instruments
Equipment
Inventions
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.
- Example(s) 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 consultations.
Appendix G
Department of Occupational Therapy & Occupational Science
Teaching Effectiveness Reporting Table

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