

**Towson University
College of Health Professions
Department of Kinesiology
Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and
Merit
Policies and Procedures**

effective Fall 2026;
revised Winter 2026;
approved by KNES Department 1/21/2026;
approved by CHP PTR 12/9/2025;
approved by University PTR 3/27/2026

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT.....	3
A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee	3
B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair	3
II. POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE	4
A. Types of Reviews.....	4
B. Confidentiality.....	4
C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios.....	4
D. Definition of Quorum	5
E. Evaluation Process.....	5
F. Merit	10
G. Reporting to Candidates.....	10
H. Appeals and Rebuttals	11
I. Review of Department PTRM Document	12
III. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE.....	13
A. Teaching and Advising.....	13
B. Scholarship	14
C. Service	15
IV. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION	16
A. Standards and Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	16
B. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Professor.....	16
C. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty.....	17
D. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations to Senior Teaching Professor.....	17
V. APPENDICES	18
Appendix A: Calendar	19
Appendix B: Annual Report.....	22
Appendix C: Annual Workload Plan	25
Appendix D: Statement of Standards and Expectations for new Tenure Track Faculty (SENTF)	28
Appendix E: Peer Observation Summary Report	31
Appendix F: Department Summary Recommendation (DSR).....	33
Appendix G: External Evaluation Guidelines.....	35

Conforming with the Towson University Faculty Handbook, the Department of Kinesiology Promotion, Tenure, Rank and Merit Committee administers the systems of faculty evaluation by implementing the provisions set forth in the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty.

I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT

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

1. All tenured faculty, clinical associate professors, and clinical professors of the department serve as members of the department's PTRM committee. Inclusive of those faculty with a joint appointment. 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 still participate on the PTRM committee. If a faculty member wishes to engage in PTRM deliberations, a formal request must be made at the time of application for sabbatical leave. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, the faculty member must be present to review materials and participate in all deliberations and discussions.

B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair

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 first Friday of May.

3. The term of service for both positions is one year. The vice chair will serve as the PTRM chair during the following academic year.

4. Should the 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.

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 appeals.

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, the PTRM committee chairperson, or the Dean in performance of their duties under the TU ART policy. Breaches in confidentiality will be reported to the department chairperson, the Dean, or the University Promotion and Tenure Committee as appropriate.
2. All votes will be by individual confidential ballot. Any voting mechanism (electronic or paper) must be secure and allow for record retention in accordance with USM records retention.
 - a. Electronic voting is the preferred method for any evaluation-related votes. The department shall follow university standards for the platform that is used such as Involved @ TU. 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. Any electronic voting method must be aligned with the ballot process articulated in the TU ART and USM record retention.
 - b. If a paper ballot is used, it will be signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member. If an electronic ballot is used it must provide similar evidence of the members who voted.
 - c. Ballots will be tallied by the PTRM committee chair and the vice chair. If electronic ballots are used and are automatically tallied, the tallies will be captured by the vice chair or an agreed upon proxy. If neither the chair nor vice chair is available, or is the subject of the deliberation, another PTRM committee member will be asked by the department chairperson to assist tallying the votes.
 - d. Count tallies will be shared with the committee immediately following the vote.
3. 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 Department Chair and the Dean's Office. The confidential ballots or corresponding electronic record regarding promotion and tenure will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be forwarded under a separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the faculty member's file until three years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university.

C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios

1. Recommendations made by the department PTRM committee are dependent on the standards and expectations developed in accordance with *Appendix 3 to 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 *Kinesiology PTRM document*.
2. After careful review and discussion 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 and teaching professor evaluation portfolios. In a circumstance when a clinical faculty member is selected to participate in PTRM deliberations by the

department chairperson (per I.A.2), the individual may only vote on clinical faculty recommendations.
c. No faculty member may be present during deliberations or voting on their own evaluation portfolio, nor evaluation portfolios for relatives, family members, or other persons indicated under Towson University's nepotism or conflict of interest policies.

3. All recommendations made by the PTRM committee must be made by a quorum (see D); the outcome will be decided by a simple majority of the votes. 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.

4. No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

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.

2. Clinical faculty members invited to attend clinical faculty deliberations (per 1.A.2) are not Department PTRM committee members and thus do not count towards a quorum.

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. Formatting and presentation should align with the most recent guidance distributed by the Kinesiology Department Chair, Kinesiology PTRM Committee, and the Provost's Office.

2. The faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions as they deem appropriate to each evaluation portfolio section.

3. 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. Evaluation portfolios shall be 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 chair will review all relevant documentation for first-year faculty, (e.g., curriculum vitae, peer evaluations, student 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.

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. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Curriculum vitae
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity or evidence of Continuing Education Units (CEU), current certifications, and/or licensure, and clinical practice

Section II:

- Completed and signed Annual Workload Plan (AWP) or Chairperson's Annual Workload Plan (CAWP) and the 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 observations for the period under review
- Advising evaluations (if available)

Section IV:

- Optional supporting statement

Section V:

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

Section VI:

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

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.

Third-Year Tenure-Track Review Process

i. Department PTRM committee evaluations of the faculty members' review will become part of their file at the department level and be shared with the Dean.

ii. The department PTRM committee will evaluate third-year review materials and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service. This statement:

- Must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion recommendation; and
- Must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of an

unsatisfactory rating and guidance for continued progress in the event of a satisfactory rating.

iii. 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 towards 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 means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable promotion and/or tenure recommendation.

iv. Feedback, in the form of a statement of progress, should be delivered in writing and in a meeting with the department chairperson and department PTRM committee chair no later than the 1st Friday in March. The statement of progress shall be provided to the Dean.

Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Curriculum vitae
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.

Section II:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AWP/CAWP and AR/CAR forms arranged from most recent to year of hire.

Section III:

- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations (if available)

Section IV:

- Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing the correlation between expectations and accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. This statement should be no more than five pages in length. The statement should include a clear scholarship plan outlining the activities and progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for promotion.

Section V:

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

Section VI:

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

d. Promotion and/or Tenure Review – Guided by the TU ART, this review follows 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 concerning the standards and expectations delineated in the TU ART, the CHP PTR, and KNES PTRM documents. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows (unless specified differently in the annual Provost’s memo):

Folder I:

- Curriculum vita

Folder II:

- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Folder III:

- University Forms: Completed and signed AWP/CAWP and AR/CAR forms arranged from with the most recent to year first.

Folder IV:

- Summative chart of quantitative student evaluation scores
- Qualitative and quantitate evaluations of teaching as tabulated by the University
- All peer observations
- Advising evaluations (if available)

Folder V:

- Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing the correlation between expectations and accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement should include a clear scholarship plan outlining activities and goals for the next five years. This statement should be no more than five pages in length.

Folder VI:

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

Folder VII:

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

e. Five-Year Comprehensive Review – per the TU ART, all tenured faculty shall have a comprehensive review at least once every five years. This review is summative for the preceding five (5) academic years. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to those of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).

i. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Process

a) 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.

b) 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.

- c) 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 faculty rank as delineated in the appropriate standards for promotion (sections III and IV).
 - 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).
- d) 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. 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.
- e) 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.
- f) Faculty members with joint appointments are to be reviewed according to the schedule of their "home" department.

f. Three-Year Clinical Contract Review – per the *Clinical Faculty Evaluations, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit Policy (02-01.08)*, clinical faculty with three consecutive positive annual reviews of performance in the past three years may request a three-year contract review. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).

g. Senior Teaching Professor Review— per the TU ART and the *Policy on Employment of Teaching Professor (02-01.05)*, teaching professors who have completed at least six years as a Teaching Professor with an established record of teaching excellence and service may submit a portfolio to be considered for the rank of Senior Teaching Professor. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).

5. During the evaluation process, the faculty member or their chairperson or program director may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed before June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the TU ART Calendar. Such information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in their evaluation portfolio or in the department chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in August. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the TU ART Calendar.

6. If information is added to the evaluation portfolio other than recommendations, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the

material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

7. When external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio of the faculty member but will be forwarded under separate cover as the portfolio proceeds through all levels of review.

F. Merit

The process for merit recommendations is not related to procedures and policies pertaining to decisions of reappointment, tenure, promotion, or five-year review. Faculty/chairpersons undergoing review for reappointment, tenure, promotion or five-year review will submit separate dossiers relevant to those reviews by the deadlines articulated in the ART document. As such, the decision of merit from this process may differ from those made through the ART process. The merit process applies to *all* fulltime faculty which includes tenure/tenure track faculty, teaching professors, clinical faculty, and professors of practice.

The department PTRM Committee will review rebuttals with respect to merit evaluation by the department chairperson.

G. Reporting to Candidates

1. After each deliberation and vote, the Department PTRM committee must prepare a letter that provides the outcome of the vote and feedback made during deliberations pertaining to teaching, scholarship and service. The letter should substantiate the recommendation and should include both majority and minority views as discussed.

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. Reappointment letters must follow the guideline outlined above.

a. Reappointment letters will focus on the period of review.

b. Reappointment 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.

c. If the Department Chair agrees with the PTRM Committee's reappointment recommendation and letter, they may add a statement of agreement with the Committee's recommendation rather than writing 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 letter.

4. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters must focus on the period of review, and follow the guideline outlined above (II.F.1). The Department Chair will develop separate letters for multi-year, promotion, and/or tenure reviews.

5. 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.

6. The recommendations of the Department PTRM and the Department Chair will be conveyed in writing and

delivered to the faculty member by the designated deadlines.

7. Negative recommendations at any level regarding the annual review, merit, promotion, tenure, reappointment and/or the comprehensive five-year review shall be delivered in writing in person and sent via the secure FDS email system according to the due dates indicated in the PTRM calendar.

6. Reviewers are also responsible for placement of their recommendation in the candidate's portfolio. 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.

H. Appeals and Rebuttals

1. All appeals and rebuttals shall be made in writing.

2. There are three (3) types of appeals/rebuttals.

a. 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.

i. The rebuttal letter, including clarifying documentation, must be submitted within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the negative recommendation.

ii. Material not referenced in the original portfolio may be included in the rebuttal only if they confute negative statements in the contested recommendation.

iii. 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.

iv. The candidate's rebuttal shall become part of the candidate's portfolio for review by each succeeding level of the review process.

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

i. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTR committee.

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

iii. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTR 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.

iv. 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.

v. 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.

c. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University Policy 06-01.00 "Policy Prohibiting Discrimination."

3. 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.

4. The procedures and process for rebuttal with respect to merit evaluation is set forth in the Merit Procedures.

I. 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 PTR committee, the dean of the college, and the university PTR 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, shall be forwarded to the College PTR Committee per the procedures and dates specified in the TU ART.

III. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY 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 Kinesiology for all reviews include the following:

A. Teaching and Advising

The KNES 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. These efforts may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to:

- Classroom-based instruction
- Updating and enhancing current courses with appropriate current content and pedagogy
- Development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement)
- Efforts related to accreditation
- Use of technology to facilitate learning and enrich course delivery
- Off-site learning, community-based and service learning
- Mentoring student research
- Mentoring related to professional preparation through internships, practical, and clinical fieldwork
- Group and individual career-related academic and professional guidance
- Group and individual advising
- Other aspects of learning and the assessment of student learning

1. The review of teaching will consider the course level, student numbers, and type of pedagogy and engagement in addition to faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the AWP.

2. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes:

- Creating a climate that is conducive to learning
- Respecting diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of students
- Supporting the learning process

3. Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness includes:

- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations
- Self-evaluation
- Evaluation of student learning outcomes

4. 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 chair, in consultation with the department chairperson, assigns peer reviews. Faculty at or above the rank of the individual to be reviewed are considered appropriate peer reviewers.

ii. Peer reviews should occur as follows:

- First-year faculty receive three (3) peer reviews. The first two occur in the fall semester before October 31. The third occurs in the spring semester. When possible, first-year faculty are observed by peers from their program.
- Faculty beyond their first year who are being considered for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and a three-year clinical contract should have two (2) peer reviews during the academic year preceding the submission of their materials for review.
- Associate clinical professors, clinical professors, and senior teaching professors who possess a record of five (5) years of strong peer reviews may only have one peer review annually at the discretion of the department chair.
- Tenured faculty undergoing comprehensive five-year review should have a minimum of two (2) peer reviews conducted within two academic years before submitting their materials for review.

iii. Based upon PTRM 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.

iv. At least one (1) 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.

v. Faculty must be observed for at least 50 minutes during synchronous sessions.

vi. 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.

vii. If they so choose, the observed faculty has up to 1 week after the discussion to provide written comments on the form.

viii. Following this discussion 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 the original going to the department Chairperson and a copy to the evaluated faculty for inclusion in their annual AR materials.

B. Scholarship

The KNES PTRM Committee values scholarship activities and acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship. The scholarship evaluation for faculty members should rely on evidence of outcomes that is consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.

1. Each faculty member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars.

2. The committee will consider the range of scholarship activities of the faculty member's evidence of substantive outcomes that are disseminated and validated. Evidence of outcomes includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Internal and external grant awards
- Peer-reviewed publications
- Book/book chapters
- Peer-reviewed presentations
- Invited presentations

3. The committee should respect 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 should 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. While evaluating service, the committee considers the extent and quality of the service contribution.

2. It is the faculty member's responsibility to describe and explain the civic and/or professional service he or she may be performing outside the university and its relevance to the profession, mission of the college, and/or university.

3. The following are types of Service-Related Activities:

- **University Service:** includes substantive participation in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and the college and/or university level.
- **Civic Service:** includes participation in the larger community (e.g., local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that are related to one's academic area of expertise.
- **Professional Service:** includes participation in professional organizations or other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national, or global).

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

Faculty in the Department of Kinesiology 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 refinement, updating, and improvement of the courses they teach.
- c. Demonstrates 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 based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field.
- f. Demonstrates effective and successful participation in student advising.

2. Scholarship

- a. Demonstrates the ability to initiate, implement, and complete scholarly work at Towson University in their area of specialty.
- b. Demonstrates a clearly defined active and ongoing scholarship agenda. The candidate's scholarship must 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 peer-reviewed items (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, grants received, authorship of books or book chapters) in addition to other scholarly activity.

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 Level.
- b. Demonstrates a record of contributions in professional service, which includes external professional organizations that contribute to advancing the mission of the university.

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 must meet the following standards in teaching:

- a. Demonstrates consistent excellence in teaching and advising
- b. Demonstrates new teaching and/or advising challenges, which have resulted in successful outcomes
- c. Demonstrates mentoring of colleagues 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 must 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 the department level as well as at either the college and/or university level and/or in a professional 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 (02- 01.08)*.

2. The minimum number of years in rank is six. The department committee and the chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion. A three-year contract may be recommended when there is a recommendation for promotion by request of the candidate.

D. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations to Senior Teaching Professor

1. Teaching Professor faculty are eligible for review for promotion and must present evidence to substantiate the promotion decision using criteria outlined in the *TU ART Policy (02.01.00)* and the *Policy on the Employment of Teaching Professors (02-01.05)*.

2. The typical number of years in rank is six. The department committee and the chairperson both make recommendations regarding the promotion.

V. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Calendar

When	What	Who
August		
Third Friday	Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.	Faculty
September		
First Friday	Department Chairperson approval for the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department Tenure and/or Promotion Committee.	Dept. Chair
Second Friday	Faculty submit appeal to chairperson for no merit decisions.	Faculty
Third Friday	Faculty notify the Department Chairperson by letter with a copy to the Dean of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.	Faculty
Third Friday	College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).	College PTR
Third Friday	First-year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
Fourth Friday	Department PTRM committee renders written decision to the dean and the faculty regarding merit appeals.	Faculty
October		
Second Friday	Department PTRM Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.	PTRM Chair
Second Friday	College PTR documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.	College PTR
Second Friday	Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTR Committee if any changes have been made.	Dept. Chair PTRM Chair
Fourth Friday	The Department PTRM Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation is distributed to the faculty members.	Dept. Chair PTRM Chair
Oct 31st	Peer observation of first-year faculty is due.	Faculty
November		
Second Friday	The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Department PTRM Committee's written recommendation with a record of the vote count; completed Department Summary Recommendation Form (Appendix D); and, the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department PTRM Chairperson to the Dean's office.	PTRM Chair
December		
First Friday	Final Revised PTRM documents due to college PTRM	Dept. Chair PTRM Chair

When	What	Who
Dec 15	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.	College PTR
January		
Third Friday	The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.	Dean
Third Friday	First-year faculty must submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
Third Friday	All documentation for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
February		
First Friday	Negative recommendations concerning reappointment and merit for first-year faculty are delivered to the Department PTRM Committee.	Dept. Chair
First Friday	The Department Chair reports with recommendations on all first-year faculty to the Dean.	Dept. Chair
March		
First Friday	Faculty under third-year review must be provided with a meeting to review written feedback on their performance toward tenure as detailed in the document.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
Second Friday	Chairperson and, as needed, Department PTRM Committee Recommendations concerning reappointment and merit of first-year faculty are due to the Dean.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
April		
First Friday	Potential external evaluators must be identified in the calendar year in which the promotion or tenure portfolio will be submitted	Dept Chair Faculty
Second Friday	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.	Department
April 15	First-year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the University President.	
Third Friday	Department PTRM Committees are formed	Department
May		
First Friday	Election for chair and/or vice chair of KNES PTRM Committee; College PTR Committees are formed (elections for membership on the College committee are already completed).	Dept. PTRM
May 31	Faculty submit dossier for merit evaluation.	Faculty
June		
Third Friday	All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson	Faculty

When	What	Who
Third Friday	Faculty submit a list of at least three (3) names of any additional faculty to be included on the department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the Department Chairperson and Dean.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
Third Friday	All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by the Chairperson and Dean of the written professional development plan.	Faculty
July		
1 st business day	The department chair sends the dean completed merit evaluations.	Dept Chair

dates may change if the corresponding documents change

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

Appendix C: Annual Workload Plan

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: Statement of Statement of Standards and Expectations for new Tenure Track Faculty (SENTF)

STATEMENT OF STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR NEW TENURETRACK FACULTY (SENTF)

Name _____ Rank _____

Department of _____

I. Faculty members will abide by the following documents:

- A. University System of Maryland policies, Towson University policies, and the Faculty Handbook.
- B. The policies and procedures of the College of _____ Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- C. The policies and procedures set forth in the Department of _____ promotion and tenure document.

II. Faculty members will observe the following general university and College of _____ expectations:

- A. Excellence in teaching and advising.
- B. Professional growth and scholarly activity.
- C. Service to the department, college, university, and/or USM.
- D. Collegiality and academic citizenship.
- E. Possession of the appropriate terminal degree. Faculty members who do not hold an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree at the time of appointment are expected to earn that degree as soon as possible. Faculty members joining the faculty in the Fall semester must earn the degree by February 1 of the following calendar year. Faculty members joining the faculty in the Spring semester must earn the degree by August 1 of the same calendar year. Faculty members who do not earn the degree by the deadline will not be reappointed for the following academic year. Only in extraordinary cases will tenure be recommended for an individual not holding the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree.

III. Faculty members will observe the following more specific requirements of the Department of _____.

In this section, list specific departmental expectations of the new faculty member—such as advising; maintaining academic standards; serving on department committees; filing of syllabi, exams, and class records; developing “themes” or “topics” courses; any special rules about multi-section, multi-instructor courses; any special rules about teaching assignments (such as balance of lower division and upper division courses, and time of teaching assignments consistent with needs of the department, etc.).

The quality of all activities—teaching, scholarship, and service—is assessed by the department committees and the college committee in arriving at recommendations.

- A. Nontenured faculty members will be formally evaluated each year. Classroom observations by tenured faculty members are an important part of this evaluation. Each classroom observation is followed by the submission of a written evaluation to the faculty member observed and to his/her P&T file.

- B. All faculty members are subject to an annual evaluation by the appropriate departmental committee(s) for purposes of third-year review or recommending promotion, tenure, reappointment, and/or merit increment. These recommendations will be based on meritorious performance appropriate to the faculty member's rank. The following will be considered in this evaluation:
1. "Teaching takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology, development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site-learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, emphasis on pedagogy including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It also includes advising responsibilities." Excellence in teaching will be evaluated via peer evaluations (including classroom observations; review of syllabi, textbooks, examinations, and other materials; review of grading standards and procedures) and student evaluations.
 2. "Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field as affirmed by its community of scholars." Evidence of scholarship includes but is not limited to peer-reviewed books, articles, reviews, poetry, fiction, computer programs, audio and video productions, presentation of peer-reviewed papers at conferences and workshops, and artistic performances.
 3. "University service shall include substantive participation in the shared governance activities of the department, college and university." It may include committee activities and new program development. "Professional service shall include activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission." "Civic service includes participation in the larger community (local, regional, national or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the university's mission."

Appendix E: Peer Observation Summary Report

Peer Observation Summary Report

Course Instructor: _____ Course Observer: _____ Pre-

Meeting Date: _____

Pre-Meeting Summary/Notes:

Course: _____ Date of Observation: _____

Rating scale: 5 = Excellent; 4= Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Needs Improvement; 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations

Knowledge of Subject: 1 2 3 4 5

[Observer to provide qualitative feedback]

Organization of Presentation: 1 2 3 4 5

[Observer to provide qualitative feedback]

Communication Skills (verbal & non-verbal): 1 2 3 4 5

[Observer to provide qualitative feedback]

Appropriate Use of Methods: 1 2 3 4 5

[Observer to provide qualitative feedback]

Relationship with Students (meeting needs, rapport): 1 2 3 4 5

[Observer to provide qualitative feedback]

Suggestions for improvement:

Overall summary/comments:

Total Points: _____ Average Points: _____ Rating: _____

Post-Meeting Date: _____

Post-Meeting Summary/Notes:

Faculty instructor response/comments regarding observation process and feedback from observer:

Signature of Course Instructor: _____

Signature of Course Observer: _____

Appendix F: Department Summary Recommendation (DSR)

**TOWSON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (DSR)**

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

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 Kinesiology Department PTRM Committee voted to recommend that you have:

- Tenure granted
- Tenure denied

The Kinesiology Department PTRM Committee recommends you for the following: Promotion to T/TT or Clinical:

- Associate Professor
- Professor
- No promotion

The Kinesiology Department Merit Committee recommends you for the following:

- No Merit
- Merit

The Kinesiology Department PTRM Committee recommends that you be:

- Reappointed
- Not reappointed

The Kinesiology 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 G: External Evaluation Guidelines

Chapter 3 §I.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 chair or designee.
- The department chair or designee in consultation with the dean, will also recommend evaluators, in addition to those recommended by the faculty member. The department chair 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 chair 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 _____ (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 last Friday in August. 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