

Department of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology (SPPA)

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit (PTRM) Policies and Procedures

(Effective X; revised Fall 2021; approved by SPPA Department 11/01/21; approved by CHP PTRM 12/15/21; approved by University PTRM 3/11/22)

Table of Contents

I. Department Committee for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit	1
A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Committee	1
1. Membership	
1. Role of Department Chair	
2. Clinical faculty participation	
3. Faculty on sabbatical leave	
B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair, Vice Chair, Eligibility, Terms, and Vacancies.....	1
1. Eligibility	
2. PTRM Committee Chair & Vice Chair election dates	
3. Term of Service	
4. Vacant PTRM positions	
5. Terms	
6. Responsibilities of PTRM Chair	
7. Responsibilities of PTRM Vice Chair	
II. Policies, Procedures, and Responsibilities of the Department PTRM Committee.....	2
A. Types of Reviews.....	2
B. Confidentiality.....	2
2. Confidentiality of ballots	
3. Forwarding of ballots in PTRM process	
4. Vote count record	
C. Deliberation and Voting Procedures.....	2
1. Guiding documents for PTRM standards and expectations	
2. Eligibility to vote, conflict of interest, abstentions	
3. Majority vote procedures	
D. Definition of Quorum.....	3
E. Evaluation Process.....	3
1. Faculty responsibility for preparing evaluation portfolio materials	
2. Guidance on preparing portfolio materials	
3. Required evaluation portfolio materials	
a. First-Year Review.....	3
b. Annual Review.....	4
c. Third-Year Tenure-Track Review.....	4
d. Promotion and/or Tenure Review.....	5
e. Five-Year Review.....	6

f. Third Year Clinical Faculty Review.....	7
4. Adding materials to evaluation portfolios.....	7
5. Notification of adding materials to evaluation portfolios	
6. External review procedures.....	7
F. Reporting Decisions to Candidates.....	8
1. Written statement guidelines	
2. Noting added materials in written statements	
3. Reappointment and merit letters	
a. Department Chair letters	
4. Promotion, Tenure, Multi-Year review letters	
5. Department Chair letters for promotion, tenure, and multi-year reviews	
6. Delivering decisions to candidates	
7. Forwarding decisions to Dean’s office.	
G. Appeals.....	8
1. Appeals process and timelines	
2. Substantive appeals	
3. Procedural appeals	
4. Appeals based on unlawful discrimination	
H. Review of Department PTRM Document.....	9
1. Three-year review cycle	
2. Approval of PTRM document changes	
3. Forwarding changes to College PTRM	
III. Department of SPPA Standards and Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.....	9
A. Evaluation of Teaching and Advising.....	9
1. Considerations in evaluating teaching	
2. Teaching effectiveness	
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness	
4. Procedure for evaluating teaching.....	10
a. Student evaluations	
b. Peer evaluations	
B. Evaluation of Scholarship.....	11
1. Considerations in evaluating scholarship	
2. Evidence of scholarship	
3. Diversity, range, and significance of scholarship	
C. Evaluation of Service.....	12
1. Considerations in evaluating service	
2. Describing community and/or professional service	
3. Describing university service	
4. Types of service related activities	
IV. Department of SPPA Standards and Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion.....	12
A. Standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.....	13
1. Teaching and advising	
2. Scholarship	
3. Service	
B. Standards and criteria for promotion to Professor.....	13
1. Teaching	
2. Scholarship	
3. Service	
C. Standards and criteria for promotion recommendations for Clinical Faculty.....	13
V. Department of SPPA Standards and Criteria for Merit Evaluation at each Level.....	13
A. Overall merit evaluation.....	13
B. Criteria for merit in teaching.....	14
C. Criteria for merit in scholarship for tenure-track and tenured faculty.....	14
D. Criteria for merit in scholarship for clinical faculty.....	15
E. Criteria for merit in service for tenure-track and tenured faculty.....	15
F. Criteria for merit in service for clinical faculty.....	16

Appendices

A. Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review Calendar.....17

B. Annual Report Forms.....20

C. Peer Observation Form.....23

D. Towson University DSR Department Summary Recommendation Form.....24

E. SPPA Department Voting Record Form.....25

Towson University
Department of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit Policies and Procedures
(Effective X; revised 11/01/2021)

Consistent with the Towson University Faculty Handbook, the Department of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology (SPPA) Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee administers the systems of faculty evaluation by implementing the provisions set forth in the document "*Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty*" (TU ART, August 2010).

I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE FOR PTRM

A. Composition of the PTRM Committee

1. All tenured faculty, clinical associate professors, and clinical professors of the department serve as members of the department's PTRM committee. The department chairperson will be a non-voting member.
2. A minimum of one clinical faculty member must be present for deliberations on clinical faculty. In a circumstance when there is not at least one clinical faculty member on the PTRM committee able to be present for clinical deliberations, a clinical faculty member in the Department who has been successfully reappointed and possesses a record of three years of positive annual reviews will be selected by the department chair in consultation with the PTRM chair to participate in PTRM deliberations on clinical faculty.
3. Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may participate on the PTRM committee but are not required to do so. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, they must be present to review materials and participate in all deliberations and discussions.

B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair, Eligibility, Terms and Vacancies

1. Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty serving on the PTRM committee.
2. The chair and vice chair positions are elected, with nominee consent, by the PTRM committee by the second Friday of April.
3. The term of service for the PTRM committee chair and vice chair is one year with the expectation that the vice chair will be elected PTRM committee chair in the following year.
4. Should the PTRM chair position be vacated, the vice chair will take on the chair role and the PTRM committee will elect a new vice chair, with nominee consent, at the next scheduled PTRM meeting. Should both positions be vacated, the PTRM committee will elect a chair and vice chair, with nominee consent, at the next scheduled PTRM meeting.
5. PTRM committee members that fill chair or vice chair vacancies that occur in the fall semester will be considered as having fulfilled their full term at the end of the academic year. Vacancies that occur in the spring semester will require the individual to fulfill their complete term in the following academic year.
6. The PTRM committee chair is responsible for the following duties: scheduling PTRM committee meetings, maintaining accurate records of PTRM decisions, delivering PTRM decisions and documents to the department chairperson and Dean, ensuring that PTRM deadlines are met, ensuring that PTRM policies and procedures are followed, and revising Department PTRM documents and calendars if needed.
7. The PTRM committee vice chair is responsible for the following duties: organizing faculty peer reviews, reviewing records of PTRM votes and decisions to ensure accurate reporting, assisting the PTRM chair with other duties as needed.

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

A. Types of Reviews

The PTRM committee will review, as required, evaluation portfolios for the following types of reviews: tenure, promotion, reappointment/annual, comprehensive five-year, third-year, first year, and merit.

B. Confidentiality

1. Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of information provided to candidates or departments by the department chairperson or the Dean in performance of their duties under the TU ART policy. Breaches in confidentiality will be reported to the department chairperson and/or Dean as appropriate.
2. All votes will be by individual confidential ballot, using either paper ballots or an approved electronic ballot system, and tallied by the PTRM committee chair and the vice chair.
 - a. If neither the chair nor vice chair is available, another PTRM committee member will be asked by the department chairperson to assist tallying the votes.
 - b. All paper ballots will include the voting member's signature, date, and Towson University ID number. Approved electronic ballot systems will include the date and approved identification.
3. The confidential ballots regarding promotion and tenure will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio. If confidential paper ballots are used, they will be placed in a sealed envelope and labeled with the faculty member's name, department, date and Department Chair's signature. Ballots will be forwarded to the Provost's Office according to instructions from the Dean and kept on file according to the Towson University ART Policy. If electronic ballots are used, results will be forwarded electronically to the Dean who will forward them to the Provost's Office.
4. The PTRM committee chair will forward a signed, dated voting record form of the result of the vote and the committee's recommendation to the Dean's Office (See Appendix D and E).

C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios

1. Recommendations made by the department PTRM committee are dependent on the standards and expectations developed in accordance with the Towson University ART policy, University Standards and Expectations, the College of Health Professions (CHP) Promotion and Tenure Policy document, the CHP Guidelines for Clinical Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit Document, and the Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology PTRM document.
2. After careful review of evaluation portfolios, each PTRM committee member will vote.
 - a. All tenured PTRM committee members vote on all evaluation portfolios.
 - b. All clinical PTRM committee members vote on clinical evaluation portfolios.
 - c. Committee members must be present for evaluation deliberations to vote. Committee members who do not attend the evaluation deliberations may not vote. Proxy votes are not allowed.
 - d. No faculty member may be present during deliberations or voting on their own evaluation portfolio, or evaluation portfolios for relatives, family members, or other persons indicated under Towson University's nepotism or conflict of interest policies.
 - e. No committee member shall abstain from a vote unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
 - f. All recommendations made by the PTRM committee must be made by a quorum (see I.D.1).
3. The outcome will be decided by a simple majority vote (greater than 50%). In the case of a tie vote, the evaluation portfolio will be reviewed again by the PTRM committee and voted on a second time. If the vote remains tied, it will be considered a negative recommendation.

D. Definition of Quorum

1. Deliberations and voting may not occur without a quorum. Quorum for the Department PTRM committee consists of at least 80% of the committee membership eligible to vote and a minimum of four voting members.
 - a. If the PTRM committee has three or fewer voting members for a deliberation, the Dean will appoint external faculty to the committee to reach a quorum. Non-departmental faculty members will be appointed to the committee per the TU ART Policy.
2. Per 1.A.2 and 1.A.3, clinical faculty must be present for deliberations on clinical faculty and are included as part of the quorum for clinical faculty votes.

E. Evaluation Process

1. The faculty member under evaluation is responsible for preparing, organizing, and submitting materials by the required deadline, and in the appropriate format, as stipulated in the TU ART calendar.
2. The faculty member is responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions as they deem appropriate to each evaluation portfolio section. All documentation should be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department standards and criteria. The type of review determines both portfolio material and process. For certain types of review, the Provost will distribute guidance on organization of portfolios. When that occurs, the Provost's guidelines should be followed.
3. Evaluation portfolio materials required for submission: Evaluation portfolios are organized by the faculty member. Due dates for all materials are outlined in the PTRM calendar (refer to the TU ART and Appendix A). The following reviews occur:
 - a. First-Year Review – The primary purpose of this review is to evaluate a first-year faculty member's performance in their first semester and make a recommendation for reappointment and merit. The department chairperson is responsible for conducting first-year reviews by the fourth Friday in January. Should the department chairperson make a negative recommendation for reappointment, the PTRM committee will convene to review materials by the second Friday in February. The department chair and, if needed, PTRM committee recommendations are delivered to the Dean no later than March 15 of the current academic year. Materials required for this review should be assembled and delivered to the department chair by the second Friday in January and indexed as follows:
 - Section I:
 - Updated CV using the approved University, College, or Department format. Activities completed during the review timespan should be highlighted.
 - The Standards & Expectations of New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) form.
 - If applicable, one representative document of scholarly activity completed during the review period.
 - If applicable, evidence of Continuing Education Units (CEU), current certifications, and/or licensure, and clinical practice.
 - Section II:
 - Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
 - Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
 - Peer evaluations for the semester under review
 - Advising evaluations (if applicable and available)
 - Syllabi of courses taught in the semester under review
 - Self-analysis and reflection of teaching/advising evaluations

- b. Annual Review – All faculty members receive an annual review based on documentation of activities that occurred between June 1 and May 31. This review results in recommendations regarding reappointment and/or merit as appropriate. Materials for this review must be assembled by the second Friday in June. The Department PTRM Committee will complete annual reviews and all required documentation by the fourth Friday in September. Faculty will receive written recommendations and vote records by the fourth Friday in October. Materials required should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV using the approved University, College, or Department format. Activities completed during the review timespan should be highlighted.
- One representative document of scholarly activity completed during the academic year.
- If not included in the signed Annual Report Part I, evidence of Continuing Education Units (including professional, teaching, administrative, or other related areas) current certifications, and/or licensure, and clinical practice.

Section II:

- Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR) (parts I & II) for the year under review.

Section III:

- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- Peer evaluations, if observed during the year under review
- Advising evaluations
- Self-analysis and reflection of teaching evaluations for any course where quantitative student evaluation scores and/or faculty peer evaluations average below 4.0.

Section IV:

- Statement of Integration to include the faculty plan for the future if the AR II does not sufficiently describe plans for the next year.

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendation letters (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Optional supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Items in this section should be select examples of the faculty member's best work and not a repository that documents every accomplishment
 - Teaching: representative course syllabi or assignments
 - Scholarship: additional scholarly publications or presentations
 - Service: notice of appointments to committees or boards

- c. Third-Year Tenure-Track Review – Tenure-track faculty are reviewed after the fall semester of their third year. The intent of the evaluation is to assess progress toward tenure and/or promotion and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where potential issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. Materials required for this review are due by the third Friday in January and should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV using the approved University, College, or Department format. Activities completed during the review timespan should be highlighted.
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms arranged from most recent on top to year of hire.

Section III:

- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations
- Self-analysis and reflection of teaching/advising evaluations

Section IV:

- Supporting statement that includes accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for promotion, and plans for the next five years with a specific focus on scholarship. This statement should be no more than five single-spaced pages in length.

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Optional supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Items in this section should include select examples of the faculty member's best work and not a repository that documents every accomplishment

i. Third-Year Tenure-Track Review Process

- 1) Department PTRM committee evaluations of the faculty member will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the Dean.
- 2) The department PTRM committee will evaluate third-year review materials by the second Friday in February and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service according to the Associate Professor promotion and tenure criteria stated in Section IV.A of this document. This statement:
 - Must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading toward a positive tenure and promotion recommendation; and
 - Must provide guidance for the improvement in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.
- 3) The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
 - Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress toward excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This ranking indicates that improvements are needed.
 - 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 promotion and/or tenure recommendation.
- 4) Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chair and the department PTRM committee chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the Dean.

- d) Promotion and/or Tenure Review – This review occurs following the timeline agreed upon by the individual faculty member's contract and the Provost's Office. Typically, the initial promotion and tenure decision occurs in the sixth year of continuous hire. The purpose of this review is to assess the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the standards and expectations delineated in the TU ART and the CHP and SPPA PTRM documents. Faculty must inform the department chairperson and Dean in writing of their intent to be considered for promotion and/or tenure by the third Friday in September the year before they wish to be evaluated. Materials required for this review should be assembled by the second Friday in June. The Department PTRM Committee will

complete the review and required documents by the fourth Friday in September. Faculty will receive written recommendations from the Department PTRM and department chairperson by the fourth Friday in October. Materials should be indexed as follows (unless specified differently in the annual Provost's memo):

Section I:

- Curriculum vita using the approved University, College, or Department format. Activities completed during the review timespan should be highlighted.
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication.

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AR I and II forms arranged from most recent to year of hire or last promotion.

Section III:

- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations
- Self-analysis and reflection of teaching/advising philosophy and student, peer, and chairperson teaching evaluations. This statement should be no more than 3 single-spaced pages in length and include graphs or tables.

Section IV:

- Supporting statement describing expectations and accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service that shows integration across areas. The statement should promote an understanding of the significance of the faculty member's contributions and include a clear scholarship plan outlining activities and goals for the next five years. This statement should be no more than five single-spaced pages in length.

Section V:

- Leave empty for recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party)

Section VI:

- Optional supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Items in this section should be select examples of the faculty member's best work and not a repository that documents every accomplishment.

d. Five-Year Comprehensive Review – per the TU ART, all tenured faculty will have a comprehensive review at least once every five years. This review is summative for the period of the preceding five academic years. The department chairperson and Dean will establish the 5-year review cycle. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review. Section II should include completed and signed AR I and II forms since the previous multi-year review. These materials are submitted and reviewed with the same calendar deadlines.

i. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Process

- 1) The comprehensive policies 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. 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.
- 2) A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of their 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.
- 3) The following two-level scale will serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - Satisfactory progress (positive recommendation). Teaching and scholarship outcomes and accomplishments and service responsibilities are commensurate with

requirements at the current faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion (section IV).

- Unsatisfactory progress (negative recommendation). Teaching and/or scholarship outcomes and/or service responsibilities are not commensurate with the current faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion (section IV).
- 4) An unsatisfactory 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 will be developed by the faculty member and approved by the department chairperson and Dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, department chair, Dean, and Provost.
 - 5) 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.
 - 6) Two consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which is in addition to those otherwise required by policy in the TU ART Document.
 - 7) Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" department.
- e. Three-Year Clinical Faculty Contract Review – per the *Clinical Faculty Evaluations, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit Policy (02-01.08)*, clinical faculty with three consecutive positive annual reviews of performance in the past three years may request a three-year contract review. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).
4. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or department chairperson may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the TU ART calendar. Such information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in their evaluation portfolio or in the department chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in August. The addition of this material and notification shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the TU ART Calendar.
 5. If information is added to the evaluation portfolio by anyone except the faculty member, then that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. A failure to notify faculty within five business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio. Faculty members have one week after notification to add a response to the added material to their evaluation portfolio. Written recommendations that are part of the PTRM evaluation process are exempt from this provision.
 6. External reviews for promotion to Associate Professor or tenure decisions are optional but recommended. External reviews for promotion to Professor are required. Faculty members under consideration should follow the Guidelines for External Peer Review in the CHP's PTRM Policies and Procedures. Potential external evaluators must be identified no later than the first Monday in April prior to the promotion/tenure review. The department chairperson will confirm the external reviewers and send review materials no later than the first Monday of July. If external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. Solicited external reviews should be received by the third Friday in August. They will not be added to the evaluation portfolio of the faculty member but will be forwarded under separate cover as the portfolio proceeds through all levels of review.

F. Reporting to Candidates

1. After each deliberation and vote, the Department PTRM committee shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement that includes the vote count and is supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and university/civic/professional service.
2. Evaluators reviewing materials that were added by administrators and faculty responses to those materials shall note that they have done so in their evaluation statements.
3. Reappointment and merit letters will focus on the period of review. However, letters for tenure-track faculty or tenured and clinical faculty considering promotion may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more detailed feedback on progress to the candidate.
 - a. Reappointment and merit letters are brief with the exception of letters needed to support a non-reappointment recommendation or merit decisions of “needs improvement” in the area of teaching, scholarship, or service. These decisions require additional information to support the decision.
 - b. If the department chairperson agrees with the PTRM Committee’s recommendation and letter, a final sentence is added to the PTRM Committee’s letter stating agreement with the recommendation. If the department chairperson disagrees with the PTRM Committee’s recommendation and/or wants to highlight other points or provide additional information, they may submit a separate letter.
4. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters should provide a clear and concise summative evaluation and focus on the period of review in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The letter should support the PTRM committee’s deliberations and vote.
5. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent recommendation for each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and 5-year comprehensive review and include it in the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio by the required deadline.
6. The recommendations of the Department PTRM and the department chairperson will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the designated deadlines. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing and in person by the department chair or sent by certified mail (return receipt-requested) to the faculty member’s last known address, post-marked no later than the date on which reports are being distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.
7. Recommendations shall be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio, which is forwarded by the department PTRM committee chairperson to the Dean’s office in the specified format by the required deadlines.

G. Appeals

1. All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative recommendation is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter. There are three types of appeals: substantive, procedural, or unlawful.
2. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either the department and/or college PTRM Committees, the department chairperson, the Dean, and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member’s performance.
 - a. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the CHP PTRM committee, Dean, or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.
 - b. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation they believe would present a more valid perspective on their performance.
 - c. Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chairperson and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of CHP recommendations shall be copied to the CHP Dean and the CHP PTRM Committee.
 - d. All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file,

including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM Committee chair.

- e. Within fifteen business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the CHP PTRM Committee, the university PTRM Committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
 - f. Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.
2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation, and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
 - a. All procedural appeals must be made to the University PTRM committee.
 - b. Appeals should address the procedural issues that led to negative decisions regarding merit, promotion, tenure, and/or comprehensive review. The appeal must be in writing, accompanied with supporting documents and delivered via certified mail or in person to the Dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within 21 calendar days following notification of a negative recommendation.
 - c. The appeal will be reviewed by University PTRM within 15 business days of a formal appeal. A decision will be sent to the faculty member with copies provided to all parties included on the original appeal letter.
 - d. Recommendations made by the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The University PTRM chair will oversee this process.
 3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, and ableness shall follow the specific procedures described in *Towson University Policy Prohibiting Discrimination (06-01.00)*.

H. Review of Department PTRM Document

1. The department shall review its PTRM document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CHP PTRM committee, Dean of the college, and the university PTRM committee.
2. The department PTRM document, when new or revised, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of all full-time faculty members.
3. Following approval, the document, along with the transmittal form, which is signed by all faculty whether they voted for or against the document, shall be forwarded to the College PTRM Committee by the second Friday in October in accordance with the procedures and dates specified in the CHP PTRM Document. Following approval by the College PTRM Committee, documents are forwarded to the University PTRM by the second Friday in February.

III. DEPARTMENT OF SPPA STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

The overarching principles that guide the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service in the Department of SPPA for all reviews include the following:

A. Evaluation of Teaching and Advising

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

- Classroom-based instructional content and pedagogy; rigor based on the course and student level
- Updated and enhanced courses that include appropriate and current content and pedagogy

- Development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement)
 - Use of technology to facilitate learning and enrich course delivery
 - Off-site learning; community-based and service-learning with students
 - Mentoring of student research
 - Mentoring related to professional preparation through internships and clinical fieldwork
 - Group and/or individual career-related academic and professional guidance
 - Group and/or individual advising
 - Other aspects of learning and/or the assessment of student learning
1. Review of teaching will consider the course level, student numbers, and type of pedagogy and engagement in addition to the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated in the annual faculty workload agreements.
 2. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes:
 - a. Creating a climate that is conducive to learning
 - b. Respecting diversity, equity, and inclusion
 - c. Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of students
 - d. Updating course content, when appropriate, to the course and learning needs of students
 - e. Developing standards of rigor appropriate to course and student level
 4. Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness includes:
 - a. Student course and advising evaluations, as applicable
 - b. Peer evaluations
 - c. Course syllabi
 - d. Select examples of teaching pedagogy or assessment
 - e. Self-evaluation
 - f. Evaluation of student learning outcomes
 5. Procedure for evaluation of teaching
 - a. By students
 - i. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. The University distributes electronic evaluations to students and subsequently sends results to faculty after the semester under review has ended. Faculty are expected to compose a summary table displaying their scores.
 - ii. All faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught on-load during the academic year.
 - iii. The evaluation portfolio must contain documentation of all courses taught during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year under evaluation. Faculty may choose to include evaluations from off-load, minimester, and summer courses.
 - b. By peers
 - i. The department PTRM committee vice chair, in consultation with the department chairperson, assigns peer reviews by the fourth Friday in September.
 - ii. Faculty who are tenured, or faculty who have completed three years of full-time teaching in a tenure-track or clinical faculty position can conduct peer reviews.
 - iii. Peer reviews shall occur as follows:
 - First year faculty: All first-year tenure-track and clinical faculty receive four peer reviews. The first two occur in the fall semester before October 31 and one of the two is conducted by the department chair. The third and fourth occur in the spring semester. First-year faculty are observed by peers from their program area when possible.
 - Tenure-track faculty: After the first year, tenure-track faculty receive two peer reviews each year.
 - Tenured faculty: Tenured faculty receive one peer evaluation each year. In the year prior to a promotion or 5-year review, tenured faculty receive two peer evaluations.

- Clinical Faculty: After the first year, clinical faculty receive two peer reviews each year. Associate clinical professors and clinical professors receive one peer evaluation each year. In the year prior to a promotion all clinical faculty receive two peer evaluations.
- iv. Based on PTRM deliberations, evaluation portfolio review, peer evaluations, and/or concerns brought forward by others to the department chairperson, the department chairperson, in consultation with the PTRM chair, may require a faculty member to have additional peer observations within the academic year. The faculty member must be notified in writing that additional peer observations will occur.
- v. At least one week's advance notice of a peer observation shall be given to the faculty member. The timing of the peer observation must allow for the completion of the peer evaluation process (including faculty review and signature) before the start of finals in the semester in which the peer observation takes place.
- vi. Prior to the peer evaluation, the faculty member being observed must provide the peer observer with a copy of the course syllabus and relevant class materials for the session being observed (lecture notes, assignments, etc.). For asynchronous online courses, the peer observer must be provided with access to the course website.
- vii. Faculty must be observed for at least 50 minutes during synchronous sessions. For asynchronous courses, lecture material or similar content should be reviewed for 50 minutes.
- viii. The faculty peer reviewer will provide the observed faculty member with the completed Peer Observation Form (See Appendix C) and written summary within two weeks of the teaching observation. The faculty peer reviewer will also invite the observed faculty to a meeting to discuss the evaluation. The observed faculty can decide whether to accept or decline the meeting.
- ix. If the observed faculty chooses, they have up to one week after the discussion to add written comments in response to the peer observation.
- x. Following any discussions and the addition of any comments from the observed faculty, the peer evaluation form (Appendix C) is signed by both the evaluator and observed faculty, with a copy going to the department chairperson and the original to the evaluated faculty for inclusion in their review materials. The document must be signed and sent to the department chairperson within three weeks of the peer observation.

B. Scholarship

The SPPA PTRM Committee values a range of scholarship activities and acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship. The evaluation of scholarship for faculty members shall rely on evidence of outcomes that are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for scholarship on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.

1. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field.
2. The committee will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member that shall include evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated. Evidence of outcomes include, but are not limited to, the following items completed in the period of review.
 - a. Internal and external grant awards and submissions
 - b. Peer-reviewed publications
 - c. Peer-reviewed books/book chapters
 - d. Peer-reviewed presentations
 - e. Invited presentations
3. The committee respects outcomes that indicate diverse forms of inquiry, a wide range of subject areas, and significance to the discipline.

C. Service

The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions that are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.

1. When evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution as defined in III.C.2 and III.C.3 below.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of community and/or professional service they may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the profession and mission of the college and/or university.
3. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain their contribution to service activities at the university.
4. The following are types of service-related activities that should be considered. Service that is expected as part of the faculty role should not be included (i.e., attending graduation, attending department meetings):
 - a. University Service: Includes substantive participation in shared governance related to committees, activities, or accreditation at a department, college, and/or university level.
 - b. Community Service: Includes participation in the larger community (e.g., local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that is related to one's academic area of expertise.
 - c. Professional Service: Includes participation in professional organizations or in other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national, or global).

IV. DEPARTMENT OF SPPA STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

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

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

1. Teaching and Advising
 - a. Demonstrates knowledge of the field(s) in which they are teaching, including current and emerging trends.
 - b. Demonstrates a history of refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses they teach.
 - c. Demonstrates a history of teaching excellence and student learning as evidenced by, but not limited to, peer and student evaluations and the faculty member's teaching narrative.
 - d. Demonstrates growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process.
 - e. Demonstrates effective and successful participation where appropriate in course development, program development, and/or assessment that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or sustained experience in the profession.
 - f. Demonstrates effective and successful student advising, if applicable.
2. Scholarship
 - a. Demonstrates the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly works at Towson University in their area of specialty.
 - b. Demonstrates a clearly defined active and ongoing scholarship agenda. The candidate's scholarship shall reflect evolving depth and breadth.
 - c. Demonstrates tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should be in the form of substantive quality peer-reviewed items (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, external grants received, authorship of books or book chapters).
3. Service
 - a. Demonstrates a record of sustained involvement in shared governance related to committees and other activities at the department, college, and/or university levels.
 - b. Demonstrates a record of contributions in professional or community service, which includes external professional or community organizations that contribute to advancing the mission of the university or the profession.

B. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Professor

1. Teaching and Advising

In addition to continuing to meet the teaching and advising standards since promotion to associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor will meet the following standards in teaching:

- a. Demonstrates consistent excellence in teaching and advising.
- b. Demonstrates a sustained history of currency in teaching and/or advising such as updated content, use of new technologies, or adopting new teaching practices, which have resulted in successful outcomes.
- c. Demonstrates a sustained history of mentoring colleagues, both formally and informally, in teaching and/or advising.
- d. Demonstrates leadership in an aspect of teaching and/or advising.

2. Scholarship

In addition to continuing to meet the scholarship standards since promotion to associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

- a. Demonstrates a clear focus in scholarly activities.
- b. Demonstrates a record of sustained scholarship that has had a substantial impact on their field of study or related to a professional issue/area.
- c. Demonstrates evidence of national reputation based on scholarship outcomes and recommendations from external reviewers.
- d. Demonstrates mentoring of colleagues in their scholarship activities.

3. Service

In addition to continuing to meet the service standards since promotion to associate professor, the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

- a. Demonstrates a sustained record of service at the department, college, university, and/or professional/discipline level since their promotion to associate professor.
- b. Demonstrates substantive leadership in a role at both the department level as well as at either the college and/or university level, and/or in a professional or community organization.
- c. Demonstrates mentoring of colleagues in their service activities.

C. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty

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

V. DEPARTMENT OF SPPA STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT EVALUATION AT EACH LEVEL

A. Overall Merit Evaluation

1. Faculty members will be evaluated for overall merit based on rank and information provided through annual reviews and assigned workload effort. There are three categories of overall merit:
 - a. Needs improvement: Performance fails to meet satisfactory standards in one of three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - b. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance meets satisfactory standards in all three performance areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.

- c. Excellent (Base Merit Plus): Performance exceeds expectations in one out of three performance categories of teaching, scholarship, and service with satisfactory performance in the remaining performance categories; performance contributed to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
- B. Department of SPPA Standards and Criteria for Merit in Teaching for Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Clinical Faculty
- 1. Needs improvement in teaching denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory teaching.
 - 2. Satisfactory (base merit) in teaching requires all of the following:
 - a. Appropriate course syllabi construction and content
 - b. Evidence of updating course content, assignments, or pedagogical methods
 - c. Evidence of positive student comments in student evaluation data included in evaluation materials
 - d. Satisfactory performance on student evaluations for all courses based on quantitative and qualitative feedback
 - e. Satisfactory performance on peer evaluations based on quantitative and qualitative feedback (when available)
 - 3. Excellence (base plus merit) in teaching requires meeting all of the requirements for the Satisfactory category in addition to:
 - a. Excellent performance on student evaluations for all courses based on quantitative and qualitative feedback and excellent performance on peer evaluations based on quantitative and qualitative feedback.
 - b. AND, successful completion of new teaching challenges, such as teaching a new course, teaching in a new course modality, making changes to course content or assignments, completing continuing education hours focused on teaching, or other efforts to improve teaching quality.
- C. Department of SPPA Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty.
- 1. The criteria for evaluating scholarship is based on the faculty member's workload expectations and achievements as outlined in the Annual Review Parts I and II. The guidelines below are based on a scholarship level of 25%. Faculty with more time devoted to scholarship should provide evidence of increased productivity. Faculty with less time devoted to scholarship should be reviewed to determine if they met (Satisfactory) or exceeded (Excellent) their scholarship plan as outlined in their Annual Report Parts I and II.
 - 2. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
 - 3. Satisfactory (base merit) in scholarship may vary depending on the faculty member's workload expectations (See C.1). For most tenured or tenure track faculty, a rating of satisfactory involves completing one of these listed scholarly products during the academic year.
 - a. Author on a submitted external grant
 - b. PI or co-PI on funded internal grant with significant research activity for the academic year in review
 - c. Author on a submitted peer-reviewed publication
 - d. Author on a Book/book chapter
 - e. Substantive authorship on a peer-reviewed presentation or student-led presentation at regional/national/international conference
 - f. Other substantive scholarly project that includes dissemination of information to others. Such projects and their scholarly merit must be clearly detailed in portfolio materials.
 - 4. Excellence (base plus merit) in scholarship requires one of these items: (1) acceptance or publication of one peer-reviewed publication, or (2) submitting one external grant as PI or co-PI during the academic year. In addition, faculty must complete one or more of the following
 - a. PI or co-PI on additional submitted external grant
 - b. PI or co-PI on funded internal or external grant
 - c. First/second/senior author on book/book chapter

- d. First/second/senior author on additional peer-reviewed publication
 - e. First/second/senior author on peer-reviewed research presentation at national/international conference or senior faculty-author on student-led presentation at regional/national/international conference
- D. Department of SPPA Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Clinical Faculty
1. The criteria for evaluating scholarship is based on the faculty member's workload expectations and achievements as outlined in the Annual Review Parts I and II. The guidelines below are based on a scholarship level of 5%. Faculty with more time devoted to scholarship should provide evidence of increased productivity. Faculty with less time devoted to scholarship should be reviewed to determine if they met (Satisfactory) or exceeded (Excellent) their scholarship plan as outlined in their Annual Report Parts I and II .
 2. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
 3. Satisfactory (base merit) in scholarship involves satisfactory maintenance of clinical excellence as evidenced by appropriate documentation related to:
 - a. Demonstration of clinical competency in the field through maintaining licensure and certification, conducting and/or participating in clinical practice outside of assigned clinical teaching responsibilities, attending clinical presentations, workshops, and/or in-service activities.
 4. Excellence (base plus merit) in scholarship requires meeting all satisfactory criteria in addition to participating in active scholarship efforts that lead to at least one of the following scholarly products:
 - a. Peer-reviewed presentation in one's area of clinical expertise at a state, regional, national, or international conference in a role as a presenting author
 - b. Author on a peer-reviewed publication
 - c. Author on a Book/book chapter
 - d. PI or co-PI on an internal or external grant
 - e. Author of content associated with clinical expertise that is disseminated beyond Towson University (i.e., clinical guidelines, treatment materials, clinical tutorials, etc.)
 - f. Advanced certification or training in specialty clinical areas (earning and/or maintaining)
 - g. Other substantive scholarly project that involved dissemination of clinical information to others beyond Towson University. Such projects and their scholarly merit must be clearly detailed in portfolio materials.
- E. Department of SPPA Standards for Merit in Service for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty.
1. Needs improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
 2. Satisfactory (base merit) in service requires the faculty member to:
 - a. Participate in service at the department, college, university, discipline, and/or profession, or participate in community engagement related to academic expertise commensurate with service workload.
 3. Excellence (base plus merit) in service requires meeting all satisfactory criteria, in addition to two of the following activities for tenured and tenure track faculty:
 - a. Significant leadership position for a university committee at any level (department, college university), or professional association, or related community association
 - b. Membership on a committee at the college or university level, professional association, or related community association.
 - c. Curriculum development and/or accreditation efforts and/or significant role in other department priorities
 - d. Peer-reviewer for research presentations, journals, and/or grants
 - e. Editor/editorial board member for peer-reviewed journal

- F. Department of SPPA Standards for Merit in Service for Clinical Faculty
1. Needs improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
 2. Satisfactory (base merit) in service requires the faculty member to:
 - a. Participate in service at the department, college, university, discipline, and/or profession, or participate in community engagement related to clinical expertise commensurate with workload.
 3. Excellence (base plus merit) in service requires meeting all satisfactory criteria, in addition to one of the following activities for clinical faculty:
 - a. Significant leadership position for a university committee at any level (department, college university), or professional association, or related community association.
 - b. Membership on a committee at the college, university, professional association, or related community association
 - c. Curriculum development and/or accreditation efforts related to administrative role and/or department priorities
 - d. Peer-reviewer for conferences, journals, and/or grants
 - e. Editor/editorial board member for peer-reviewed journal

APPENDIX A: Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review Calendar

DATES	ANNUAL REVIEWS	PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEWS	TENURED FACULTY FIVE YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS	FIRST YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW	THIRD YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW
June					
2 nd Friday	Evaluation portfolios for annual review, promotion, tenure and 5-year review are submitted to Dept Chair and PTRM Chair.				
3 rd Friday			If comprehensive review was negative, Dept Chair and Dean approve faculty professional development plan		
July					
1 st Monday		If needed, external peer reviewers receive materials from Dept Chair			
August					
3 rd Monday	If needed, Dean appoints non-department members to PTRM Committee to reach a quorum.				
3 rd Friday	Final date to add information to evaluation portfolios for work completed by May 31.				
3 rd Friday		If received, external peer review letters are shared with Dept PTRM Committee separate from evaluation portfolio			
4 th Monday	Dept PTRM Committee begins review of promotion, tenure, and annual review materials				
September					
3 rd Friday		Letter of intent for Promotion and/or Tenure decision for the following year sent to Dept Chair and Dean		SENTF is finalized with Dept Chair	
4 th Friday	Dept PTRM Committee annual, promotion/tenure, & comprehensive reviews are completed				
4 th Friday	Peer Teaching Observation Schedule is distributed by PTRM Chair				
October					
2 nd Friday	Dept PTRM Committee reports with faculty recommendations and vote counts are submitted to the Department Chair				
2 nd Friday	Dept PTRM Policy & Procedure Documents are delivered to the College PTRM Committee if any changes are made				
4 th Friday	Dept PTRM Committee reports with recommendations & Dept Chair evaluations are distributed to faculty members. (See Dept PTRM document for appeal deadlines)				
October 31 st				Two peer observations are completed	

DATES	ANNUAL REVIEWS	PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEWS	TENURED FACULTY FIVE YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS	FIRST YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW	THIRD YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW
November					
2 nd Friday	Department Summary Recommendation Forms, Vote Record Forms, are forwarded by Dept PTRM Chair to the Dean's Office	Faculty member's evaluation portfolio including all dept and chair written recommendations, vote counts, is forwarded by the Department PTRM Chair to the Dean's Office.			
December					
Dec 15th		College PTRM Committee initiates review of promotion and tenure candidates.			
January					
2 nd Friday				First Year evaluation portfolio submitted to Dept Chair	
3 rd Friday		Dean's written recommendation for promotion/tenure is completed.			Third Year evaluation portfolio submitted to Dept Chair
4 th Friday				Dept Chair completes first year review. If negative, recommendations are delivered to Dept PTRM Chair	
February					
2 nd Friday	Dept PTRM Policy & Procedure Documents are delivered to the University PTRM Committee (with an approval form signed by all faculty) if any changes are made.				
2 nd Friday				If needed, Dept PTRM Committee completes first year review	Dept PTRM Committee completes 3 rd year review

DATES	ANNUAL REVIEWS	PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEWS	TENURED FACULTY FIVE YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS	FIRST YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW	THIRD YEAR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY REVIEW
March					
1 st Friday					Third Year faculty meet with Dept Chairperson and PTRM Chair to receive feedback on progress toward tenure
March 15th				Dept Chairperson and if needed, Dept PTRM Committee recommendations for 1 st year faculty are delivered to faculty member and Dean	
3 rd Friday		Provost's decision letter on promotion/tenure delivered to faculty, Dept Chairperson, Dean			
April					
1 st Monday		If needed, list of external peer reviewers delivered to Dept Chairperson			
2 nd Friday	Dept PTRM chair and vice chair elections if needed. Vice chair assumes chair position, new vice chair elected College PTRM Committee representative and alternate elections for 3-year term if needed				
April 15 th				1 st Year faculty notified of non-reappointment	
May					
1 st Friday	College PTRM Committee determines leadership and committees				

APPENDIX B: ANNUAL REPORT FORMS

ANNUAL REPORT (AR)

Part I

Reporting On Activities For Academic Year

June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

Name _____ Rank _____

Department of _____

Area of Specialization _____

Appointed to TU faculty: at rank _____ in year _____.

Promotion History:

To rank _____ in year _____,

To rank _____ in year _____, and

To rank _____ in year _____.

I. Formal Degrees

A. Highest degree earned, with date and name of granting institution. If received since June 1, 20__, attach proof.

B. If candidate for an advanced degree, indicate work completed since June 1, 20__ and present status. Corroborative material and/or transcript must be attached.

II. Teaching

(percentage of workload: _____ %)

A. 1. Attach evaluations from all of your teaching assignments for the fall, mini, spring, and summer terms from the course evaluation reports provided by the Office of Assessment (If your department or college uses an alternative or additional course evaluation survey that has been approved by the UPTRM, then you may also include those results). The course evaluation reports from the Office of Assessment will each include the course title and number, credit hours, number of students enrolled/responding, and response data for each item (median, mean, standard deviation, N).

2. You may, if you wish, include a narrative statement on your teaching that includes your interpretation of the course evaluations and how you intend to use the results to inform and improve your teaching.

3. Insert below your class GPA and grade distribution. These data are provided to your dean's office by the Office of Institutional Research (Fall data are sent in February and Spring data are sent in mid-June). Your dean's office will distribute these data to departments. You may fill out this table by indicating the number of students in each grade category, or you may electronically insert the information by cutting and pasting the entire section from the report.

Grade Dist	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	D+	D	F	Total	W	O	Mean
Course														

- 4. Attach syllabi for all courses listed (must contain all elements required for syllabi in Policies and Procedures for the Classroom: Course Syllabus).
- B. Non-classroom assignments which are part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers).
- C. New instructional procedures which you have introduced this year (special projects, new courses and/or materials).
- D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain.

- III. Scholarship (percentage of workload: ___%)
 [Attach corroborative material where appropriate]

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain.

- IV. Service (percentage of workload: ___%)
 [Indicate any of these activities which are part of your workload]

Community:

Profession:

University (all levels):

Correlation Statement. If your productivity did not match your projections for academic year 20__-20__, please explain.

ANNUAL REVIEW (AR)

Part II

Agreement On Faculty Workload Expectations For Academic Year

June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

I. Teaching (percentage of workload: _____%)

A. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the 20__-20__ academic year.

B. Non-classroom assignments which will be part of your regular on-load teaching assignment (i.e., coaching, directorships, supervision of student teachers) for the 20__-20__ academic year.

C. New instructional procedures which you plan to introduce this year (special projects, new courses and/or materials). Also include interdisciplinary, diversity, international and new technology projects, if appropriate.

D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students)

II. Scholarship (percentage of workload: _____%)

III. Service (percentage of workload: _____%)
[For any of these activities which are part of your workload, please indicate.]

Community:

Profession:

University (all levels):

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member _____

Date _____

Chairperson of Department _____

Date _____

Dean of College _____

Date _____

APPENDIX C: PEER OBSERVATION FORM
DEPARTMENT of SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY
FACULTY PEER EVALUATION - CLASS OBSERVATION REPORT

 Faculty Member

 Peer Observer

 Class Number

 Date and Start-End Time

 Faculty Signature/Date

 Peer Observer Signature

 Average Rating

Likert Scale Ratings:

5 = Excellent or All of the time 4 = Good or Most of the time 3 = Average or Some of the time
 2 = Below Average or Sometimes 1 = Poor or Never

SYLLABUS	Rating	Comments
The syllabus reflected reasonable learning objectives, assessment, and grading.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
The syllabus was clear and easy to understand.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Course content as reflected in the syllabus was current.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
ORGANIZATION: The instructor:	Rating	Comments
Provided a brief overview of objectives at the beginning of class.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Indicated transitions between topics.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Periodically summarized main points of topics, or summarized at the end of class.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Stayed on topic.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Included class activities and materials that were consistent with course objectives.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Used class time effectively.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
CLARITY: The instructor:	Rating	Comments
Provided practical/concrete applications of concepts.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Stressed important points by slowing the presentation or indicating their importance.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Used graphs, diagrams, visual aids, and/or instructional technology to facilitate student learning.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Answered clearly student's questions.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Appeared aware of student learning style/rate differences.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Maintained appropriate pace for student understanding.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
INTERACTION: The instructor:	Rating	Comments
Communicated in an effective, engaging manner.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Maintained eye contact with students.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Asked questions of individual students and the class as a whole.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Encouraged students to participate in discussions and ask questions.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Acknowledged appropriately students for their contributions.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Addressed students by name.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	
Used effective collaborative activities in class.	1 2 3 4 5 n/a	

1 Items: _____ #2 Items: _____ #3 Items: _____ #4 Items: _____ # 5 Items: _____ Average: _____

Narrative (required): Assess course content and the instructional style. Provide explanations for any rating of 3 or below. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

APPENDIX D

TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)

DEPARTMENT OF _____

RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR YEAR _____

FOR _____

(Faculty Member)

This form is to be completed for all tenure track and clinical faculty by each department upon the conclusion of its PTRM process each fall. When promotion or tenure is being considered, it is forwarded as part of the faculty member's file to the appropriate college promotion and tenure committee for use during its deliberations. Recommendations on merit, reappointment, and five year comprehensive reviews are to be forwarded directly from the department to the dean of the college.

By signing this form faculty members indicate that they have read this form and are aware of the department's recommendation(s); their signatures do not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendation(s). Faculty who wish to appeal the recommendation(s) should follow procedures found in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty.

The _____ Department PTRM Committee voted to recommend that you have:

- Tenure granted
- Tenure denied

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following:

Promotion to T/TT or Clinical:

- Associate Professor
- Professor
- No promotion

The _____ Department Merit Committee recommends you for the following:

- No Merit
- Base Merit
- Base +Merit

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:

- Reappointed
- Not reappointed

The _____ Department PTRM Committee recommends that your performance for the period covered by the Five Year Comprehensive Review be judged:

- Satisfactory
- Less than Satisfactory

Committee Chair Signature _____ Date _____

Faculty Member Signature _____ Date _____

In the event of multiple decisions made by different committees with different committee chairs, those committee chairs should add their signatures on the backside of this form.

7/11/2013

APPENDIX E

SPPA Voting Record of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Reappointment and Merit Committee 20__

Faculty (Rank)		Tenure/ Reappoint Vote	Promote Vote	5-Year Comp Review	Merit Review	Merit Teaching Vote	Merit Scholarship Vote	Merit Service Vote	Merit Overall Decision
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				
	Yes				No Merit				
	No				Satisfactory				
					Excellent				

PTRM Chair/date

Department Chair/date