

Department of Health Sciences

Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Policies and Procedures

Approved by the Department of Health Sciences 12/05/25

Approved by CHP PTR Committee 12/05/25

Approved by University PTR Committee 03/27/2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE(S) FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT AND MERIT	1
A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit (PTRM) Committee and Clinical Evaluation Committee	1
B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair	1
C. Duties of the PTRM Committee Chair	1
D. How Alternates are Chosen/Vacancies Filled	2
E. Policies, Procedures, and Responsibilities of the Department Committee	2
II. REVIEW OF FACULTY	4
A. Types of Reviews	4
B. Annual Review	4
C. First Year Faculty Review Portfolios	5
D. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty	5
E. Promotion and/or Tenure Review	7
F. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Faculty	8
G. Joint Appointments	8
H. Clinical Faculty Review	9
I. Assistant Teaching Professor Review	9
J. Reporting to Candidates	9
K. Negative Recommendations: Rebuttals & Appeals	10
L. Changes to the Department Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Document	11
III. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE	12
A. Teaching and Advising	12
B. Scholarship	14
C. Service	15
IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	16
A. Teaching and Advising for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	16
B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	16
C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	16
V. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	17
A. Standards and Criteria for Teaching and Advising for Promotion to Professor	17
B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Promotion to Professor	17
C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Promotion to Professor	18

VI. MERIT REVIEWS	18
VII. CALENDAR	19

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Potential Evidence for Teaching/Advising, Scholarship, and Service	23
APPENDIX B: Guidelines for External Peer Review	25
APPENDIX C: University Forms: Annual Report (AR) and Annual Workload Plan (AWP)	27
APPENDIX D: Department Summary Recommendation	31
APPENDIX E: Voting Record	32
APPENDIX F: Document Review Timeline	33

Towson University
Department of Health Sciences

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Policies and Procedures

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

A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit (PTRM) Committee and Clinical Evaluation Committee

1. All tenured faculty members in the department will serve as members of the PTRM Committee. The Department of Health Sciences Chairperson sits ex-officio and will be a non-voting member.
2. The PTRM Committee plus one Clinical faculty member will serve as the Clinical Evaluation Committee for evaluation of Clinical faculty for promotion, reappointment, and/or a three-year contract, and also non-tenure track faculty for promotion and reappointment.
3. The Clinical faculty member elected by secret ballot to the Clinical Evaluation Committee must be at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or higher with either a multi-year contract or three or more consecutive one-year contracts. They will serve for one year with options for renew. The Clinical faculty member on the Clinical Evaluation Committee is a voting member of the committee as described in (2) above.

B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair

1. Eligible nominees include all tenured faculty with at least one year of experience serving on the PTRM Committee.
2. The chair is elected, with nominee consent, by the PTRM Committee to a two-year term with the option for reappointment for an additional year by the second Friday of April.

C. Duties of the PTRM Committee Chair

1. Organizing and chairing all relevant committee meetings.
2. Ensuring the completion of documentation and securing necessary signatures.
3. Recording the vote count for all deliberations.
4. Submitting votes to Dean's Office.
5. Developing and distributing the faculty peer evaluation schedule.
6. Convening the committee to review and make recommendations on the Department Chair's negative merit recommendation if a faculty member appeals this. (See Section VI.)
7. Reviewing the Department of Health Sciences PTRM documents along with the committee members and submitting possible changes to the Department Chairperson.

D. How Alternates are Chosen/Vacancies Filled

1. If the PTRM Committee Chair is unable to serve a full term, an alternate will be elected to serve as an interim chair for the remainder of the PTRM Committee Chair's term.
2. In the event there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department when a candidate is being considered for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, the committee will be supplemented with tenured faculty members from other departments within the College. If a faculty member being reviewed has a joint appointment with another department, a tenured faculty member from that department will be asked to serve as a reviewer and voting member for that faculty.
3. The additional tenured faculty member(s) shall be selected by the Department Chair and the CHP Dean from a list of at least three faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review.
4. In the event there are no clinical faculty members meeting the committee appointment requirements in the department when a clinical faculty candidate is being considered for promotion or reappointment, the committee will be supplemented with a clinical faculty member from another department within the College. This clinical faculty member shall be selected by the Department Chair and the CHP Dean from a list of at least three clinical faculty members recommended by the faculty member under review.

E. Policies, Procedures, and Responsibilities of the Department PTRM Committee

1. Types of Reviews
The PTRM Committee will review evaluation portfolios for the following types of reviews: reappointment/annual, first-year, third-year, tenure, promotion, and comprehensive five-year reviews as well as three-year clinical contracts.
2. Confidentiality
 - a) Recommendations made by the Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee are dependent on the standards and expectations developed in accordance with Appendix 3 to the *Towson University ART policy (ART)*, *University Standards and Expectations*, and the CHP Promotion and Tenure Policy document.
 - b) Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the Chair or the Dean in performance of their duties under the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) policy.
 - c) All votes regarding tenure and/or promotion taken by the PTRM Committee shall be by confidential electronic or paper ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair. If the chair is unavailable, another PTRM Committee member will be asked by the Department Chair to tally the votes.
 - d) The PTRM Committee may use other means of confidential voting and voting records, such as Involved@ TU (electronic voting) so long as the

ballot information and the balloting process follows that articulated in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty. All ballots must collect the Faculty ID number. Any voting mechanism must be secure and allow for records retention in accordance with USM records retention policies. While it is NOT necessary to use the TU Ballot Summary, a paper copy of the electronic voting record, which includes a record of faculty ID numbers associated with each ballot, must be printed and kept on file per the ART policy.

3. The PTRM Committee Chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the result of the vote and the committee's recommendation to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio. The ballots shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Dean.
4. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios.
 - a) After careful review, each committee member will vote.
 - b) For a vote to take place, there must be a quorum (i.e. a minimum of three tenured committee members) present. Tenured faculty vote on all evaluation portfolios. Clinical faculty are only eligible to vote on non-tenure track faculty evaluation portfolios (e.g., Clinical faculty and teaching professors).
 - c) No faculty member may be present for deliberations or voting on their own evaluation portfolio, nor evaluation portfolios for relatives, family members, or other persons indicated under Towson University's nepotism or conflict of interest policies.
 - d) The vote outcome will be decided by a majority vote. In the case of a tie vote, the case will be reviewed again by the entire committee and voted on a second time. If the vote remains deadlocked, it will be considered rejection of a motion (i.e., a negative decision).
 - e) No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion or reappointment unless the Provost authorizes such abstention for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
 - f) Faculty members on sabbatical or leave may vote. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, the faculty member must be present during the review of materials and all discussions that pertain to the faculty member being reviewed.
 - g) The PTRM Committee Chair shall forward a signed, dated letter of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. Once the department has completed deliberations about a candidate and decided on its recommendation of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate's materials are forwarded to the Dean by the date specified by the University calendar.
 - h) The Department of Health Sciences Chairperson submits a substantive statement that either agrees or disagrees with the Department PTRM Committee's recommendation. The Department Chairperson's letter is included with the faculty candidate's documents that are forwarded to the College.

II. REVIEW OF FACULTY

A. Types of Reviews

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. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized according to Provost's guidelines and in accordance with II.B and II.E below.
3. Guided by the chairperson and the department, the college, and the university criteria, the faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions, as the faculty member deems appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section. In order to ensure that all materials and documentation used in making recommendations contain appropriate information, all documentation shall be submitted in the form of an evaluation portfolio that addresses the professorial role, expectations of faculty in the university, and the faculty member's college and department standards and criteria. The type of review determines both portfolio material and process.
4. The faculty member or the chairperson participating in the evaluation process 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 Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Five Year review, Three Year Review, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar. The information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by the faculty member either in the evaluation portfolio or in the chairperson or program director'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.
5. If the chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's portfolio, other than the recommendation, 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. Failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the portfolio.
6. If at any level confidential, 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. See Appendix B for details about this process.

B. Annual Review

Non-tenured 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. If on a multi-year contract, faculty will be reviewed according to the term of their contract. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV, with publications in current APA format and accomplishments during the period under review highlighted in yellow
- One representative document of scholarly activity during the academic year.
- If applicable, evidence of Continuing Education Units (CEU), current certifications, and/or licensure, and clinical practice.

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Workload Plan (AWP) and Annual Report (AR) for the year under review (Do not include the AWP for the upcoming academic year.)
- AR should include the required Teaching Reflection

Section III:

- Qualitative and quantitative student evaluations of teaching for the period under review as tabulated by the University.
- Peer teaching evaluations for the period under review
- Syllabus for each course taught
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores (optional)
- Advising evaluations (optional)
- Grade Distributions (optional)

C. First Year Faculty Review

The primary purpose of this review is to evaluate a first-year faculty member's performance in their first semester and make a recommendation for reappointment. The department chair will review all relevant documentation for first-year faculty, including CV, teaching, and peer evaluations; meet with the candidate to discuss the review; and make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment to the Department PTRM Committee. Should the Chair's recommendation be for non-reappointment, the Department PTRM Committee will convene to review the relevant documentation and vote following standard PTRM procedure and report the outcome no later than the second Friday in March. Chair and Department PTRM recommendations will advance to the College Dean on the same day. The Dean shall advance their recommendations to the Provost no later than by the third Friday in March.

D. Third Year Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. By the third Friday in January of a tenure-track candidate's third year at Towson University, they shall submit materials for their Third Year Review. These materials should mirror those required for going up for tenure/promotion – see Section E, Promotion and/or Tenure Review.
2. The PTRM Committee will assess progress toward tenure and advise the faculty member. The purpose of the review is to provide assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement

- where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. The PTRM Committee evaluation of a candidate's progress will only become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and will be shared with the Dean.
3. After evaluation of the third-year review portfolio based on department standards, the Department PTRM Chair will prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service and other relevant criteria. This statement must include an indication of whether the faculty member's work to date is leading to a positive promotion and tenure decision and must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a Satisfactory or Needs Improvement rating. (See three-level scale below.)
 4. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - a) *Superior progress*. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence 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 ranking indicates that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory, but improvements may be needed.
 - c) *Needs Improvement*. This evaluation requires change by the faculty member across one or more dimensions, because the current performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable tenure decision.
 5. Written feedback to the faculty member shall be provided during a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair and the Department PTRM Committee Chair no later than the first Friday in March. The Dean receives a copy of the written report.
 6. If a faculty members' mandatory tenure review year is prior to the 6th year of continuous full-time service, the standard annual review by the department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

E. **Promotion and/or Tenure Review**

Guided by the TU ART, this review occurs following the timeline agreed upon by the individual faculty member and the Provost's Office. The purpose of this review is to assess the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the standards and expectations delineated in the TU ART and the CHP and Department PTRM documents. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows (unless specified differently in the annual Provost's memo):

Section I:

- Updated CV
 - with references in current APA style
 - highlight in yellow accomplishments for the period under review

Section II

- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section III:

- University Forms: Completed and signed Annual Workload Plan (AWPs) and Annual Report (ARs) (Appendix C) arranged from most recent to year of hire or time of last promotion.

Section IV:

- Teaching Narrative
 - Comprehensive and in addition to those appearing in Annual Reports; should address teaching and advising philosophy and include an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.
- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores for onload courses. (Offload courses are optional.)
- Qualitative and quantitative student evaluations of teaching provided by the University
- All peer teaching evaluations
- Advising evaluations (optional)

Section V:

Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing: 1) correlation between expectations and accomplishments; 2) future goals; and 3) integrating accomplishments in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service

Section VI:

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

Section VII:

- Supplemental materials in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service

F. Comprehensive Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty

Once every five years, based on the established schedule for review, there shall be a comprehensive five-year review. Faculty evaluation will include teaching, through student evaluations and peer review; assessment of scholarship, primarily through peer review and consistent with the University, College and Department standards and mission; and service as defined in this document.

1. Materials used for the comprehensive review are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review, above. (AWPs and ARs for the period under review should be provided.)
2. The comprehensive policies herein are following the principles established by the USM Board of Regents on 7/12/96 and shall not be construed to substitute for them. The review shall be conducted following all policies, including rebuttals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
3. A faculty member who has submitted a formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of their comprehensive review cycle intending to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the review process at the discretion of the college Dean.
4. The following two-level scale will serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - a) Satisfactory progress (positive recommendation). Teaching and scholarship outcomes and accomplishments and service responsibilities are commensurate with requirements at faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion (sections III and IV).
 - b) Unsatisfactory progress (negative recommendation). Teaching and/or scholarship outcomes and/or service responsibilities are not commensurate with faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion (sections III and IV).
5. A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the chair and the Dean by the third Friday in June of the academic year in which the negative review occurred. The plan shall be signed by the faculty member, chair, dean, and provost.
 - a) 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.
 - b) Two (2) consecutive comprehensive reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.

G. Joint Appointments - Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" department.

- H. **Clinical Faculty Review** – for information concerning review of clinical faculty, please see *Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluations, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit (02-01.08)*.
- I. **Assistant Teaching Professor Review**– for information concerning review of teaching professors, please see *Policy on the Appointment, Rank, and Promotion of Teaching Professors (formerly “Lecturers”) (02-01.05)*.
- J. **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, regarding each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service. Feedback will include both majority and minority views.
 2. Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the review process shall note that they have done so in their evaluation statements.
 3. Recommendation letters will focus on the period of review. Letters for tenure-track faculty may be expected to serve a more extensive function, and the department may provide feedback on progress towards tenure to the candidate.
 4. The Department Chair shall prepare an independent recommendation of 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.
 5. Regarding annual reviews and reappointment, the Department Chair may add a statement of agreement with the Committee’s recommendation rather than write a separate letter. If the Department Chair disagrees with the PTRM Committee’s recommendation, wants to highlight other points, or provide additional information, they may submit a separate recommendation letter.
 6. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters should provide a clear and concise summative evaluation focused on the period of review and support the PTRM Committee’s deliberations and vote. Feedback will include both majority and minority views.
 7. The recommendations of the Department PTRM Committee and the Department Chair will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member by the deadlines designated in the PTRM calendar. Negative recommendations shall be delivered via the secure FDS email system in accordance with the due dates indicated in the PTRM calendar.
 8. Recommendations shall be added to the faculty member’s evaluation portfolio which is forwarded by the department PTRM Chair to the Dean’s office in the specified format by the required deadlines.

K. Negative Recommendations: Rebuttals & Appeals

1. Negative Recommendations

Negative recommendations at any level regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered via the secure FDS email system according to the due dates indicated in the PTRM calendar. Reviewers are also responsible for placement of their recommendation in the candidate's portfolio.

2. Appeals and Rebuttals

- a) All appeals and rebuttals shall be made in writing.
- b) There are three (3) types of appeals/rebuttals.
 - i. To contest perceived errors in judgment by the department and/or college PTR committees, the department chairperson, the dean, and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of their performance, the candidate may submit a written rebuttal. The President's decision is final and is not subject to rebuttal.
 - a. The rebuttal letter, including clarifying documentation, must be submitted within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the negative recommendation.
 - b. Material not referenced in the original portfolio may be included in the rebuttal only if they confute negative statements in the contested recommendation.
 - c. The candidate's rebuttal letter shall be directed to the next review authority and placed alongside the negative recommendation in the candidate's portfolio. The next review level shall make no recommendation on the candidate's application until receiving the rebuttal or until the allowed time has elapsed.
 - d. The candidate's rebuttal shall become part of the candidate's portfolio for review by each succeeding level of the review process.
 - ii. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
 - a. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTR committee.
 - b. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be sent via the secure FDS email or in person to the respective dean, Provost, or UPTR chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation.

- c. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department Chair, the department PTRM Chair, the dean and the University PTR committee chair. Appeals of college recommendations shall be copied to the college dean, the college PTR committee, the department chair, and the University PTR committee chair. Appeals of Provost recommendations shall be copied to the dean and department chair.
 - d. Within twenty-one (21) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the University PTR 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.
 - e. Recommendations of the University PTR committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The chair of the University PTR committee will monitor the appeal process.
- iii. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University Policy 06-01.00 "Policy Prohibiting Discrimination."
- c) The President's decision on reappointment, tenure, promotion and comprehensive five-year review shall be final. The Provost's decision on merit shall be final.

L. Changes to the Department Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Document

All changes to the Department of Health Sciences PTRM policies and procedures document must be approved by the Department faculty and forwarded to the CHP PTR committee by the 2nd Friday in October. (For a PTRM Document Review Timeline, see Appendix F.)

- 1. Changes can be voted on by all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- 2. Changes are approved by a simple majority of those eligible to vote.

III. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING/ADVISING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

In accordance with the TU ART policy:

1. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall fulfill the workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours, and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
2. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
3. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.
4. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship.
5. Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.
6. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance.
7. A Department of Health Sciences faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described herein.

The overarching principles that guide the evaluation of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service in the Department of Health Sciences for annual review, comprehensive review, promotion and tenure, and reappointment include the following:

A. Teaching and Advising

The Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee values a range of teaching and learning experiences for our students. The Committee acknowledges that student advising occurs in a variety of contexts including intentional advising, academic and professional guidance. The overarching principles that guide the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service in the Department of Health Sciences for annual review, comprehensive review, and promotion and tenure include the following:

1. The Department PTRM Committee acknowledges that teaching and advising encompass a range of activities and occur in various contexts. The evaluation of teaching and advising for faculty members should rely on evidence of activities

- consistent with the proportion of time allotted for teaching and advising on the individual faculty member's workload agreement. Teaching effectiveness shall be based on student evaluations provided by the University and peer teaching evaluations as well as the judgment of evaluating committees. Criteria for evaluating teaching shall be based on the following considerations:
- a) Striving for excellence and competence as a teacher in courses at all levels of the curriculum, as appropriate to the faculty members' areas of expertise and interests and the department's curricular needs.
 - b) Exhibiting ongoing growth as a classroom teacher at all stages of the career, developing new methods, pedagogies, and competencies and engaging in honest self-evaluation.
 - c) Demonstrating competency as reflected in peer and student evaluations.
 - d) Preparing syllabi for each course in accordance with University and Department standards.
2. Teaching may take a variety of forms, including the following:
- a) Classroom-based instruction,
 - b) Development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement),
 - c) Faculty exchanges and teaching abroad,
 - d) Off-site-learning,
 - e) Appropriate use of educational technology,
 - f) Supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis or dissertation preparation,
 - g) Emphasis on pedagogy including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum,
 - h) Other aspects of learning and its assessment.
3. Review of teaching will consider the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.
4. Student advising responsibilities are integral to a faculty member's teaching role. This role encompasses a range of activities, such as:
- a) Academic advising,
 - b) Intentional advising (e.g. career & graduate education planning, recommendation writing, networking events, major/minor declarations, research guidance),
 - c) Guidance of students in the learning process within one's class teaching responsibilities,
 - d) Advising groups in academic honor societies and other student groups,
 - e) Serving on an undergraduate or graduate research committee.
5. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be focused on student learning which includes:
- a) Creating a supportive climate that is conducive to learning,
 - b) Respecting diversity and inclusion at a variety of levels,
 - c) Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of the students,
 - d) Supporting the learning process,
 - e) Encouraging subject mastery.

6. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:
 - a) Peer evaluations
 - i. Peer evaluations take place according to the following schedule:
 - a. Tenure-track faculty – two reviews per year.
 - b. Tenured faculty – two reviews conducted during the five-year review period (one must be during the year immediately prior to review).
 - c. Non-tenure-track faculty require two reviews per year for the first three years, then one review per year - two reviews are required in the year prior to review for promotion.
 - ii. Based upon PTRM Committee deliberations and evaluation portfolio review, the department chairperson, in consultation with the PTRM Chair, may require a faculty member to have additional peer observations within the academic year of review.
 - iii. Faculty must be observed for at least 50 minutes during synchronous sessions.
 - iv. Following the observation or the online review, the faculty evaluator will meet with the observed faculty member to review a written summary and discuss the evaluation, within 2 weeks of the teaching observation.
 - v. If they so choose, the observed faculty has up to 1 week after the discussion to provide written comments on the form.
 - vi. Following this discussion and the addition of any comments from the observed faculty, the peer evaluation form is signed by both the evaluator and observed faculty, with the original going to the department Chairperson and a copy to the evaluated faculty for inclusion in their annual AR materials.
 - b) Student evaluations,
A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations
 - c) Evaluation of student learning outcomes
 - d) Other sources of teaching and mentoring evaluation including professional societies and awards.
7. All on-load courses taught by faculty shall be included in their evaluation of teaching. This includes all on-load courses of whatever type (e.g., in person, online, offsite, internship). Faculty may choose to include offload course evaluations.

B. Scholarship

The Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee values a wide range of scholarship activities. The committee acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship.

1. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars. Faculty are expected to develop a focus area(s) with a number of peer-reviewed publications. See Appendix A.

2. The committee will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member, which shall include evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated. Evidence of outcomes includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a) Internal and external grant awards
 - b) Peer-reviewed publications
 - c) Book/book chapters
 - d) Peer-reviewed presentations
 - e) Invited presentations
3. Review of scholarship will consider the allocation of faculty time devoted to scholarship as stated in annual faculty workload agreements.
4. Additionally, all faculty should consult college and university guidelines.

C. Service

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

1. While evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution.
 - a) Service within the University includes substantive participation and/or leadership in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and at the college and/or university level.
 - b) Professional Service: includes participation and/or leadership in professional organizations or in other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national or global), which advances the mission of the discipline.
 - c) Civic and Community Service: includes participation and/or leadership in the larger community (e.g., local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that are related to one's academic area of expertise.
 - d) It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of civic and or professional service they may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the mission of the college and or university as applicable.
2. Additionally, all faculty should consult college and university guidelines.

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

In accordance with the TU ART policy the rank of an associate professor is described as: "In addition to having the qualifications of an assistant professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have demonstrated excellence in teaching and successful experience in research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and be competent to offer graduate instruction and direct graduate research. The appointee shall have a minimum of six years of full-time university/college teaching experience. Exceptions may be made for comparable professional activity or research. There shall also be evidence of relevant and effective service to the University, the community, and the profession."

The Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee's evaluation of a faculty candidate for Associate Professor will comply with the college and university's criteria.

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

1. Demonstration of knowledge of the field(s) in which they are teaching, including current and emerging trends.
2. Demonstration of refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses that one teaches.
3. Demonstration of teaching excellence and student learning as evidenced by but not limited to peer and student evaluations and the faculty member's teaching narrative.
4. Demonstration of growth and evolution that supports the teaching and learning process.
5. Demonstration of effective and successful participation where appropriate in course development, program development and/or assessment that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field.
6. Demonstration of effective and successful participation in student advising.

B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Demonstration of the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in the area(s) of specialty.
2. Demonstration of a clearly defined active and ongoing agenda. 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 peer-reviewed publications and substantive scholarly activity (e.g., grants received, authorship of books or book chapters).

C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor:

1. A record of sustained involvement in shared governance related to committees and other activities at the Department, and College, and/or University Level.
2. A record of activities that extend beyond the routine expectations of all faculty members.

3. A record of contributions to a professional and/or community organization, and/or in a civic engagement activity in their area of professional expertise that go beyond simply being a member, and which advance the University's mission.

V. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SCIENCES PTRM STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

In accordance with the TU ART policy, the rank of Professor is described as: "In addition to having the qualifications of an associate professor, the appointee ordinarily shall have established an outstanding record of teaching and research, scholarship, or where appropriate, creative performance, and, where appropriate to the mission of Towson University, a national reputation. The appointee shall have a minimum of ten years of full-time university/college teaching experience. 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.

Department of Health Sciences PTRM Committee's evaluation of faculty candidates to Professor will comply with the college and university criteria.

A. Standards and Criteria for Teaching and Advising for Promotion to Professor

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

1. Demonstration of consistent excellence in teaching and advising,
2. Demonstration of new teaching and/or advising challenges, which have resulted in successful outcomes,
3. Demonstration of mentoring of colleagues in teaching and/or advising,
4. Demonstration of leadership in an aspect of teaching and/or advising.

B. Standards and Criteria for Scholarship for Promotion to Professor

In addition to continuing to have 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 focus in scholarly activities,
2. A record of sustained scholarship that has had a substantial impact on their field of study or related to a professional issue/area,
3. 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. This scholarship could be within the faculty member's area of expertise or could be interdisciplinary.

4. Demonstration of mentoring of colleagues in their scholarship activities.
5. Letters of evaluation from external reviewers, which will be solicited from outside the University pursuant to the Guidelines approved by the University Senate (See Appendix).

C. Standards and Criteria for Service for Promotion to Professor

In addition to continuing to have met the service standards since promotion to Associate Professor the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor will meet the following standards:

1. Demonstration of a sustained record of service at the department level and at the college or university level since their promotion to associate professor.
2. Substantive leadership in a role at the department level, the college or university level, as well as at the professional level or as part of civic engagement.
3. Demonstration of mentoring colleagues in their service activities.

VI. MERIT REVIEWS

Faculty members will be evaluated for Merit through a process separated from reappointment, third-year review, promotion and tenure, and five-year comprehensive review.

For details see <https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/fulltime-faculty-merit-process2024.pdf>

VII. CALENDAR (See also University Calendar from TU ART Document)

(Also referenced: First Year Flowchart UPTR Website:

<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/uptrm/firstyearflowchart.pdf>)

Second Friday in April	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Election for a representative to the College PTR Committee and their alternate for the upcoming academic year will be conducted. These members will serve a three-year term. 2. Election for Chair of Health Sciences Department PTRM Committee
First Friday in May	Department and College PTR Committees are formed (elections for membership on the College committee are already completed).
Third Friday in June	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio. This includes annual reappointment portfolios and comprehensive review portfolios (e.g., for tenure, promotion, five-year review). 2. Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and Dean. 3. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chairperson and Dean of the written professional development plan.
First Monday of July	Suggested timeline for Department Chair to submit materials to external peer reviewers.
August 1 (USM Mandated)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. 2. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in the ART policy.
First Friday in September	If needed, Department Chairperson approves the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department Tenure and/or Promotion Committee.
Second Friday in September	University PTR Committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee's Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.

Third Friday in September	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty notify Department Chairperson by letter with copy to the Dean of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year. 2. College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary). 3. Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1 unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a. 4. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure Track Faculty (SENTF) (or AWP for non-tenure-track faculty) with the Department Chairperson.
Fourth Friday in September	<p>Department Chairperson notifies department faculty, Dean, and Provost of any department faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.</p>
Second Friday in October	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department PTRM Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson. 2. College PTR documents are due to the University PTR Committee if changes have been made. 3. Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTR Committee if any changes have been made.
Fourth Friday in October	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department Chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and comprehensive five-year review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member. 2. The Department Chairperson will place the independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio. 3. The Department PTRM Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
Second Friday in November	<p>The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department PTRM Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, completed Department Summary Recommendation Form (see appendices), Department Vote Record (see appendices), and the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department PTRM Chairperson to the Dean's office.</p>

November 30th	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All documentation to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio. 2. The Dean must notify the Provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. 3. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the Dean or sent by FDS.
December 15th (USM Mandated)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year. 2. The College PTR Committee will conduct a review of promotion and tenure materials submitted to the College during and/or immediately following the final exam periods and hold possibly one meeting at the beginning of January, if needed.
First Friday in January	The College PTR Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the Dean.
Third Friday in January	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. 2. The College PTR Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the Dean's recommendations are conveyed in writing to the faculty member. 3. All documentation for the First-Year review of faculty is submitted for evaluation by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson. (This includes SENTF for tenure-track faculty and AWP for others.) 4. All documentation for the Third-Year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted for evaluation to the Department Chairperson by the faculty member.

First Friday in February	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The College Dean forwards the portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the Dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive review to the Provost. 2. The Dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the Provost. If the Dean disagrees with the Department recommendation, the Dean shall prepare a recommendation, send a copy to the faculty member, and add this recommendation to the portfolio. 3. If first-year faculty recommendation is for non-reappointment, Chair forwards all materials to the Department PTRM Committee.
Second Friday in February	If applicable College PTR Committee transmits Department documents concerning promotion and/or tenure/reappointment (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) to the University PTR Committee.
Third Friday in February	Chairperson and, as needed, Department PTRM Committee recommendations concerning reappointment of first year faculty are due to the Dean.
Fourth Friday in February	Dean's recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded to the Provost.
March 1st	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, Department and College PTR Committee Chairpersons, Department Chairperson, and Dean of the College. 2. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.
First Friday in March	Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.
Fourth Friday in March	Negative recommendations concerning reappointment of first year faculty are delivered from the Dean to the Provost's Office.
First Monday in April	Potential external evaluators for faculty going up for Professor must have been identified.
April 15th	First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the University President.

APPENDIX A: POTENTIAL EVIDENCE FOR TEACHING/ADVISING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICE

	Potential Evidence
Teaching / Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of one’s teaching/advising philosophy • Documents demonstrating significant changes to course syllabi over time • Copies of course and program proposals • Demonstration of participation in accreditation or program approval change • Evaluations of instruction by current students • Periodic analysis and interpretations of the student’s evaluations • Peer observation by faculty • Evaluations obtained by means of focus groups • Standardized tests scores or pre/post test results • Refinement of teaching methods, materials, and strategies • External or internal curriculum and instructional development grants • Teaching awards and nominations • International teaching exchange, sabbatical, or consulting contracts • Articulation of mentoring relationships with junior faculty, clinicians, or other professional colleagues • Consultation regarding teaching within and beyond University • Advising evaluations • Effective guidance and advising that enables students to complete their research projects • Evidence of knowledge of emerging needs in one’s field • Effective participation in course and program development • Demonstrated leadership in course and program development • Demonstrated leadership in accreditation and program approval • Participation on accreditation or program approval teams • Evidence of respecting diversity and inclusion at a variety of levels • Evidence of novel or exemplary teaching methods, materials, or strategies • Evidence of mentoring students and other faculty members

<p>Scholarship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications in peer reviewed journals • Publication of a book, book chapter, or monograph • Competitive internal and external grants as PI, Co-PI, Faculty Consultant, or Project Director attempted and received • Citation of others of one's scholarship • External evaluation and reviews of one's scholarly work • Invitations to review the research and scholarship of others • Presentations of one's scholarship • Reports of scholarship or projects in progress
<p>Service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active involvement in faculty governance at the department, college or university level • Leadership positions in the department, college or university • Leadership or advocacy in student activities, organizations and programs • Advocacy in addressing important issues or needs • Provision of in-service education or technical assistance • Professional consultations • Membership in professional organizations at the national, regional, and state levels • Committee membership in professional organizations • Leadership in professional organizations and associations • Service to licensure, certification or accreditation boards

Appendix B: Guidelines for External Peer Review

https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/documents/externalevaluationguidelineswithletter_finaldraft.pdf

EXTERNAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Chapter 3 §1.B.3.f provides that departmental and college promotion and tenure policies may include an option for external reviews as part of the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. Departments and colleges are encouraged to solicit such external reviews and are directed to incorporate these guidelines into their promotion and tenure policies should external reviews be made part of the evaluation process.

I. CONFIDENTIALITY

- External reviews will not be made available to the faculty member being reviewed (“Candidate”) and will not be included in the Candidate’s faculty evaluation portfolio.
- External reviews will be forwarded to each level of review under separate cover.

II. IDENTIFYING EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

- Evaluators will be independent and impartial. Evaluators cannot be members of Towson University faculty nor can they be current or former advisors or mentors to the Candidate, or otherwise have (or have had) a personal or significant professional relationship with the Candidate.
- Evaluators must be established scholars or practitioners of demonstrated expertise in the area of the Candidate’s specialization preferably from peer institutions.

III. SELECTION OF EVALUATORS

- The Candidate will have the opportunity to recommend evaluators who meet the criteria set forth in §II to the Department Chairperson or designee.
- The Department Chairperson or designee in consultation with the Dean, will also recommend evaluators, in addition to those recommended by the faculty member. The Department Chairperson or designee will select at least 5 evaluator(s) of those recommended by the faculty member who meet the criteria set forth in §II and will select, in addition 5 other evaluator(s) so that a minimum of 10 evaluators are identified as potential evaluators.
- The Department Chairperson or designee will contact the potential evaluators to identify those evaluators who agree to provide evaluations.
- Potential external evaluators must be identified no later than the first Monday in April of the calendar year in which the promotion or tenure portfolio will be submitted and confirmed no later than the first Monday of July.
- Following confirmation of the external evaluators, the chair or designee will write each evaluator using the letter template attached to these guidelines.

IV. SUBJECT MATTER OF EXTERNAL REVIEW

- 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 appropriate to the Candidate’s discipline such as books, articles, grant proposals, computer programs, visual works or performance reviews.
- The Candidate’s Department Chairperson or designee must provide these materials to all external evaluators no later than July 1. The Candidate’s curriculum vitae will be included with the materials provided external evaluators.

Date

Dr.
Department of
Towson University
8000 York Road
Towson, Maryland 21252

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator of the scholarly/creative work of _____, ("Candidate"), who is being considered for promotion from _____ to _____ (or who is being considered for tenure at Towson University). I am sending under separate cover the publications (and/or other materials) that I am asking you to review.

Pursuant to the University's promotion and tenure policy, your review will remain confidential and will not be made available to the Candidate. Only officially constituted faculty committees and academic administrators authorized to evaluate the Candidate for promotion (or tenure) will have access to your evaluation and this correspondence.

Please provide an objective assessment of the Candidate's accomplishments as a scholar (or reference specific work in other fields as appropriate) and your opinion on whether the Candidate has demonstrated the degree of accomplishment required for promotion to _____ (and/or for tenure) at _____

In making your evaluation of the candidate's work, please address the following:

1. What, if any, has been your professional and/or personal relationship with the Candidate?
2. What is the significance of the issues addressed by the Candidate's work?
3. What is your assessment of the originality and the quality of the work?
4. Is the methodology used appropriate to the issues addressed and consistent with best practices in the field?
5. Does the work produce useful lines of future inquiry for the Candidate and/or for others in the field?
6. Has the Candidate's work appeared in journals, been exhibited in galleries, published by presses, or in professional or performance venues that are appropriate to the field that are indicators of quality work?
7. Does the body of the Candidate's work reviewed indicate continuing development as a scholar (or creative artist)?

In addition to responding to these specific inquiries, please feel free to comment on other aspects of the Candidate's scholarly work.

Due to the calendar for promotion and tenure decisions, please complete your review of the material and submit your evaluation by _the third Friday in September. Please address all correspondence to me at the address above, marked "Confidential."

Thank you for your assistance in this important matter. It is essential to sustaining the academic quality of Towson University that we call upon outside evaluations to assist us in judging the professional scholarship performance of our faculty. We realize how time-consuming this task is, and we are truly grateful for professional service you will render on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Appendix C: UNIVERSITY FORMS

ANNUAL REPORT (AR)

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 and Advising (percentage of workload: _____ %)

A. 1. Assure that all course evaluations and course syllabi are added to the appropriate Merit portfolio folder.

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. Provide a brief (1-4 paragraphs) descriptive reflection on your teaching practice this past year. Highlight interpretations of data you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student feedback) to inform and guide your future teaching practices. Potential items may include (but are not limited to) levels of satisfaction with course assignments and work manageability, students' take-aways and/or gaps in understanding, grading and providing feedback, DEIJ considerations, digital accessibility, opportunities to fold in new concepts and perspectives into coursework, or other pedagogical innovations.

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 strategies which you have introduced this year (e.g., special projects, new courses and/or materials).

D. Advising (including number of students, whether majors, undeclared, or interdisciplinary students).
Optional: Provide a descriptive reflection on your student advising practice this past year. Highlight interpretations of advising efforts that you have found meaningful (e.g., self, peer, and/or student feedback) to inform and guide your future advising practices

III. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (percentage of workload: ____%)
[Attach corroborative material where appropriate]

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

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

Department:

College:

University:

Community:

Profession:

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

Updated by Office of the Provost and Approved by Academic Senate 12/2022

ANNUAL WORKLOAD PLAN (AWP)

Agreement On Faculty Expectations For Academic Year

June 1, 20__ - May 31, 20__

- I. Teaching and Advising (percentage of workload: _____%)
- A. List all of the regular classroom teaching assignments planned for the 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 academic year.
- C. New instructional strategies which you plan to introduce this year (e.g., 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. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (percentage of workload: _____%)
- III. Service (percentage of workload: _____%)
[For any of these activities which are part of your workload, please indicate.]

Department:

College:

University:

Community:

Profession:

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member _____

Date _____

Chairperson of Department _____

Date _____

Dean of College _____

Date _____

Updated by Office of the Provost and Approved by Academic Senate 12/2022

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 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 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 _____

APPENDIX E - Voting Record

Department of _____

Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit Committee Votes Fall _____
 based on Academic Year _____)

Faculty (Rank)		Tenure/ Reappoint Vote	Promote Vote	5 YR Review	Faculty (Rank)		Tenure/ Reappoint Vote	Promote Vote	5 YR Review
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			
	Yes					Yes			
	No					No			

This voting record is an accurate reflection of the deliberations of the PTR and ARM Committees.

 Department PTRM Chairperson/Date

 Department Chairperson/Date

Appendix F

PTR Document Review Timeline

These steps take place during the prior AY (AY-1) and the year of review (AY0); the approved PTR documents become active at the start of the following AY (AY1).

The Second Friday in March of the prior year

College PTR documents are due to the University PTR committee if changes have been made.

The Second Friday in May of the prior year

Department PTRM documents are delivered to the college PTR committee if any changes have been made.

The UPTR committee has completed first reviews of the college PTR documents.

The Fourth Friday in October

The college PTR committee has completed first reviews of the department PTRM documents.

The UPTR committee has reviewed the college PTR documents.

Second Friday in December

Department PTRM documents (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the UPTR committee.

The Second Friday in March

The UPTR committee has completed first reviews of the department PTRM documents.

The Second Friday in May

The UPTR committee has reviewed the college PTR documents.