

# Department of Kinesiology

## Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit Policies and Procedures

*(Effective Fall 2021; revised Fall 2020; approved by KNES Department 1/28/21;  
approved by CHP PTRM 2/5/21; approved by University PTRM 5/14/21)*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE(S) FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, AND MERIT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Composition of the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Committee.....	1
B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair .....	1
<b>II. POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Types of Reviews.....	1
B. Confidentiality .....	2
C. Deliberation and Voting on Evaluation Portfolios .....	2
D. Definition of Quorum .....	3
E. Evaluation Process .....	3
F. Reporting to Candidates .....	8
G. Appeals.....	8
H. Review of Department PTRM Document.....	10
<b>III. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE.....</b>	<b>10</b>
A. Teaching and Advising.....	10
B. Scholarship .....	12
C. Service .....	12
<b>IV. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
A. Standards and Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor .....	13
B. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Professor .....	13
C. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations for Clinical Faculty.....	14
D. Standards and Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer.....	14
<b>V. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT EVALUATION AT EACH LEVEL.....</b>	<b>15</b>
A. Merit Evaluation.....	15
B. Department of Kinesiology Standards and Criteria for Merit in Teaching for Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical Faculty, and Lecturers.....	15
C. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty ..	15
D. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Clinical Faculty.....	16
E. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Lecturer Faculty .....	16
F. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty .....	16
G. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Clinical Faculty.....	17
H. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Lecturer Faculty.....	17
<b>APPENDIX A: CALENDAR.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: ANNUAL REPORT FORMS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: PEER OBSERVATION TEMPLATE .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION FORM .....</b>	<b>24</b>

**Towson University**  
**Department of Kinesiology**  
**Promotion, Tenure, Rank, and Merit Policies and Procedures**  
**(Effective X; revised Fall 2020)**

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 document “*Appendix 3 to the Towson University Policy on Appointment, Tenure and Rank of Faculty*” (ART, August 2010).

- 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. 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. In order to vote on any faculty evaluation recommendations, they must be present to review materials and participate in all deliberations and discussions.
  - B. Election of PTRM Committee Chair and Vice Chair
    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.

B. Confidentiality

1. Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of information provided to candidates or departments by the department chairperson or the Dean in performance of their duties under the TU ART policy. Breaches in confidentiality will be reported as appropriate.
2. All votes will be by individual confidential ballot and tallied by the PTRM committee chair and the vice chair.
  - a. If neither the chair nor vice chair is available, another PTRM committee member will be asked by the department chairperson to assist tallying the votes.
  - b. If a paper ballot is used, it will be signed with the Towson University ID number and dated by the voting member.
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 Dean's Office. The confidential ballots 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 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 lecturer 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.
  - d. 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.
  - e. All recommendations made by the PTRM committee must be made by a quorum (see D.1); 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.

3. 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.
  2. The faculty member shall be responsible for making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and shall include such distinctions as they deem appropriate to each evaluation portfolio section. All documentation 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.
  3. 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 UPTRM unanimously passed a motion, reviewed by the Academic Senate at its 10/17/19 meeting, supporting the Provost's recommendation to modify the procedure for first year faculty review by eliminating the reappointment portfolio due in December. According to this recommendation: In lieu of a December portfolio submission and committee review, 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 in accordance with 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 by that same day. The Dean shall advance their recommendations to the Provost no later than by the third Friday in March. This revised review process is a permanent change and will be the standard procedure moving forward.
    - b. Annual Review – All faculty members receive an annual review based on documentation of activities that occurred between June 1 and May 31. This review results in recommendations regarding reappointment and/or merit as appropriate. Materials required for this review should be assembled and indexed as follows:

Section I:

- Updated CV
- 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:

- Completed and signed Annual Report (AR) or Chairperson Annual Report (CAR) (parts I & II) for the year under review (AR II for forthcoming academic year is not required)

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

Section I:

- Curriculum vita
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section II:

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

Section III:

- 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)

Section IV:

- Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing 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 towards 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.

i. Third Year Tenure-Track Review Process

- 1) Department PTRM committee evaluations of the faculty member's review will become part of their file at the department level and shared with the Dean.
- 2) 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 a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.
- 3) The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
    - Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.
    - Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress 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 essentially means that continuance on this performance trajectory is unlikely to result in a favorable promotion and/or tenure recommendation.
  - 4) Feedback, in the form of a statement of progress, should be delivered both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the department chairperson and department PTRM committee chair no later than the 1<sup>st</sup> Friday in March. The statement of progress shall be provided to the Dean.

- d. 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 KNES 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:

- Curriculum vita
- A copy of one recent peer-reviewed publication

Section II:

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

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 correlation between expectations and accomplishments in the areas of 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.

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

- 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 period of the preceding five (5) academic years. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).
  - i. Five-Year Comprehensive Review Process
    - 1) The comprehensive policies herein are in accordance with the principles established by the USM Board of Regents on 7/12/96 and shall not be construed to substitute for them. The comprehensive review shall be conducted in accordance with all policies, including appeals, relevant to the Annual Review process except as noted in this section.
    - 2) A faculty member who has submitted formal notice of retirement during the fourth or fifth year of their comprehensive review cycle with an intention to retire at the end of that cycle may be exempted from the comprehensive review process at the discretion of the Dean of the college.
    - 3) The following two-level scale will serve as a general guideline for the review:
      - Satisfactory progress (positive recommendation).  
Teaching and scholarship outcomes and

accomplishments and service responsibilities are commensurate with requirements at 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).

- 4) A negative comprehensive review shall be followed by the development of a written professional development plan to remediate the faculty member's failure to meet minimum expectations as noted in the comprehensive review. This written plan shall be developed by the faculty member and approved by the 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.
  - 5) The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following approval of the plan. Evidence of improvement must be clearly discernible in evaluation portfolio materials submitted in the next annual review process. Lack of evidence of discernible improvement may result in a formal warning, sanction, or termination.
  - 6) Two (2) consecutive annual reviews indicating the faculty member has not met minimum expectations shall occasion an immediate comprehensive review, which shall be in addition to those otherwise required by policy.
  - 7) 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 Lecturer Review– per the TU ART and the *Policy on Employment of Lecturers (02-01.05)*, lecturers who have completed at least six years as a Lecturer with an established record of teaching excellence and service may submit a portfolio to be considered for the rank of Senior Lecturer. The materials included in this portfolio are identical to that of a promotion and tenure review (per II.E.3.d).
4. During the course of the evaluation process, the faculty member or their chairperson or program director may add to the evaluation portfolio information related to work that was completed prior to June 1 that has only become available after the deadline stipulated in the TU ART Calendar. Such information shall relate specifically to the faculty member's performance as presented by either the faculty member in their evaluation portfolio or in the department chairperson's evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Information added by the faculty member to update the

evaluation portfolio must be included by the third Friday in August. The addition of said material and notification thereof shall not interfere with the time designated for review as described in the TU ART Calendar.

5. If information is added to the evaluation portfolio, 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. A failure to notify faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.
  6. If external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio of the faculty member, but will be forwarded under separate cover as the portfolio proceeds through all levels of review.
- F. Reporting to Candidates
1. After each deliberation and vote, the Department PTRM committee shall prepare a concisely written but detailed statement which includes the vote count, and is supportive of its recommendation, with reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship, and University/civic/professional service.
  2. Evaluators reviewing materials that have been added by the faculty member or administrators during the course of the review process shall note that they have done so in their evaluation statements.
  3. Reappointment and merit 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 more extensive feedback on progress towards tenure to the candidate.
    - a. Reappointment and merit letters are brief with the exception of letters needed to support a non-reappointment recommendation which requires additional information to support the recommendation.
    - b. If the Department Chair agrees with the PTRM Committee's 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. The Department Chair will develop separate letters for multi-year, promotion and/or tenure reviews.
  4. Promotion, Tenure, and Multi-Year Review letters should provide a clear and concise summative evaluation and focus on the period of review and support the PTRM committee's deliberations and vote.
  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 to the faculty member by the designated deadlines. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in writing in person by the Department Chair or sent by certified mail (return receipt-requested)

to the faculty member's last known address, and post-marked no later than the date on which reports are being distributed to the faculty member according to the university PTRM calendar.

7. Recommendations shall be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio which is forwarded by the department PTRM committee chairperson to the Dean's office in the specified format by the required deadlines.

#### G. Appeals

All appeals shall be made in writing. The timeframe for appeals at all levels is twenty-one (21) calendar days beginning with the date that the negative recommendation is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of the certified letter. There are three (3) types of appeals:

1. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by either the department and/or college PTRM Committees, the department chairperson, the Dean and/or the Provost with regard to evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
  - a. The next higher level shall serve as the appeals body. Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the CHP PTRM, Dean or Provost within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.
  - b. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under review with any statement, evidence, or other documentation they believe would present a more valid perspective on their performance.
  - c. Appeals of departmental recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the department PTRM chair. Appeals of CHP recommendations shall be copied to the CHP Dean and the CHP PTRM Committee.
  - d. All challenge material shall be placed in the evaluation portfolio under review no later than five (5) business days before the evaluation portfolio is due to the next level. All material placed in the file, including challenge material, shall become a part of the cumulative expansion of the evaluation portfolio and shall not be removed by subsequent levels of evaluators. The evaluation portfolio under review, with additions, will be forwarded to the next level by the appropriate PTRM Committee chair.
  - e. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of a formal appeal with attached materials, the recipient of the appeal (e.g. the CHP PTRM Committee, the university PTRM Committee, or the Provost) shall review the case and provide a written response to the substantive appeal. Copies of this response will be provided to all parties who were copied on the original appeal letter.
  - f. Recommendations made by the Provost may be appealed to the President whose decision is final.
2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed in the review, recommendation and notification process, and shall follow the procedures below.
  - a. All procedural appeals must be made to the University PTRM committee.

- b. Appeals should address the procedural issues that led to negative decisions regarding merit, promotion, tenure, and/or comprehensive review. The appeal must be in writing, accompanied with supporting documents and delivered via certified mail or in person to the Dean, Provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days following notification of a negative recommendation.
  - c. The appeal will be reviewed by University PTRM within fifteen (15) business days of a formal appeal. A decision will be sent to the faculty member with copies provided to all parties included on the original appeal letter.
  - d. Recommendations made by the University PTRM committee may be appealed to the President whose decision shall be final. The University PTRM chair will oversee this process.
3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and ableness shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University *Policy Prohibiting Discrimination (06-01.00)*.
- H. Review of Department PTRM Document
1. The department shall review its PTRM document every three years and submit evidence of such review to the CHP PTRM committee, dean of the college and the university PTRM committee.
  2. The department PTRM document, when new or revised, shall be approved by a simple majority vote of all full-time faculty members.
  3. Following approval, the document, along with the transmittal form, shall be forwarded to the College PTRM Committee in accordance with 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 a variety of contexts. The evaluation of teaching and advising for faculty members should rely on evidence of activities which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for teaching and advising on the individual faculty member's workload agreement. These efforts may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to:

- Classroom based 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 of 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. Review of teaching will consider the course level, student numbers, and type of pedagogy and engagement in addition to the allocation of faculty time devoted to teaching as stated within the annual faculty workload agreements.
  2. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness includes:
    - a. Creating a climate that is conducive to learning
    - b. Respecting diversity, equity, and inclusion
    - c. Using new teaching/learning methods when appropriate to the course content and learning needs of students
    - d. Supporting the learning process
  4. Evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness includes:
    - a. Student evaluations
    - b. Peer evaluations
    - c. Self-evaluation
    - d. Evaluation of student learning outcomes
  5. Procedure for evaluation of teaching
    - a. By students
      - i. Student evaluations of instruction are a required part of the evaluation of faculty. The University distributes electronic evaluations to students and subsequently sends results to faculty after the semester under review has ended. Faculty are expected to compose a summary table displaying their scores.
      - ii. All faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught on-load during the academic year.
      - iii. The evaluation portfolio must contain documentation of all courses taught during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year under evaluation. Faculty may choose to include evaluations from off-load, minimester and summer courses.
    - b. By peers
      - i. The department PTRM committee chair, in consultation with the department chairperson, assigns peer reviews. Faculty at or above 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. First year faculty are observed by peers from their program when possible.
        - Faculty beyond their first year who are being considered for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and 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 lecturers 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 two (2) peer reviews conducted within two academic years preceding the submission of 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 a range of scholarship activities and acknowledges that faculty engage in various forms of scholarship. The evaluation of scholarship for faculty members should rely on evidence of outcomes which are consistent with the proportion of time allotted for service on the individual faculty member's workload agreement.

1. Each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development and currency in their academic field as affirmed by a community of scholars.
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 include, 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. The committee will 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 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.
  - 2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe and explain the type of 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:
    - a. University Service: includes substantive participation in shared governance related to committees or activities at a departmental level and at the college and/or university level.
    - b. 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.
    - c. Professional Service: includes participation in professional organizations or in other venues external to the university (e.g., local, regional, national or global).

#### IV. DEPARTMENT OF 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 that is 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 shall reflect evolving depth and breadth.
      - c. Demonstrates tangible evidence of sustained scholarly activities with substantive outcomes. This evidence should be in the form of substantive 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, and College, and/or University Level.
      - b. Demonstrates a record of contributions in professional service, which includes external professional organizations which 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 will 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 will meet the following standards:

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

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

    - a. Demonstrates a sustained record of service at the department, college, university, and/or professional/discipline level since their promotion to associate professor
    - b. Demonstrates substantive leadership in a role at 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. If requested by the candidate, a three-year contract may be recommended when there is a recommendation for promotion.
- D. Standards and Criteria for Promotion Recommendations to Senior Lecturer
1. Lecturer 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 Lecturers (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. DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR MERIT EVALUATION AT EACH LEVEL
- A. Merit Evaluation
1. Faculty members will be evaluated for merit based on rank, the information provided through annual reviews, and on assigned workload effort. There are three (3) categories of merit:
    - a. Needs improvement: Performance fails to meet expected standards.
    - b. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance meets standard and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
    - c. Excellent (Base Merit Plus): Performance must exceed expectations. Excellence in one out of three performance categories of teaching, scholarship, and service and satisfactory performance in two out of three of the performance categories.
- B. Department of Kinesiology Standards and Criteria for Merit in Teaching for Tenured, Tenure Track, Clinical Faculty, and Lecturers
1. Needs improvement in teaching denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory teaching.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in teaching requires all of the following:
    - a. Appropriate course syllabi construction and content
    - b. Evidence of positive student comments in student evaluation data included in annual binder
    - c. Satisfactory performance on student evaluations for all courses based on quantitative and qualitative feedback
    - d. Satisfactory performance on peer evaluations based on quantitative and qualitative feedback (when available)
  3. Excellence (base plus merit) in teaching requires meeting all of the requirements for Satisfactory in addition to:
    - a. Above average or outstanding performance on student evaluations for all courses based on quantitative and qualitative feedback
    - b. Above average or outstanding performance on peer evaluations based on quantitative and qualitative feedback (when available)
- C. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

1. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in scholarship involves appropriate documentation of one (1) scholarly product during the academic year which may include:
    - a. Submitted external grant
    - b. PI or co-PI on internal grant with significant research activity for the academic year in review
    - c. Peer-reviewed publication (including published book review)
    - d. Book/book chapter
    - e. First-authored peer-reviewed presentation at regional/national/international conference
  3. Excellence (base plus merit) in scholarship requires appropriate documentation of a minimum of one (1) peer-reviewed publication during the academic year in addition to one (1) or more of the following activities:
    - a. PI or co-PI on submitted external grant
    - b. PI or co-PI on funded internal or external grant
    - c. First/senior author on book/book chapter
    - d. First/senior author on peer-reviewed publication
    - e. First/senior author on peer-reviewed research presentations at national/international conferences
- D. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Clinical Faculty
1. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in scholarship involves satisfactory maintenance of clinical excellence as evidenced by appropriate documentation related to the following activities:
    - a. Demonstration of clinical competency in the field through conducting and/or participating in clinical practice outside of primary teaching responsibilities, clinical presentations, workshops, and/or in-service activities.
    - b. Active collaboration in research activities and/or other appropriate research activities (e.g., presenting at teaching conferences, etc.).
  3. Excellence (base plus merit) in scholarship requires meeting all satisfactory criteria in addition to providing appropriate documentation of at least one (1) of the following scholarly products:
    - a. Peer-reviewed research presentation in one's area of expertise at conference in a role as a presenting author
    - b. Peer-reviewed publication
    - c. Book/book chapter
    - d. PI or co-PI on a grant
    - e. Author of ancillary published content associated with clinical expertise
- E. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Scholarship for Lecturer Faculty
1. Needs Improvement in scholarship denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory scholarship.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in scholarship involves appropriate documentation related to active steps have been taken during the year to maintain or enhance disciplinary and teaching currency, relevant to the courses in the Lecturer's teaching program, through a program of reading, investigation,

- training, or presentation (based on criteria outlined in *02-01.05, Policy on the Employment of Lecturers*).
3. Excellence (base plus merit) in scholarship requires meeting all satisfactory criteria in addition to providing appropriate documentation of research involvement and outcomes.
- F. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty
1. Needs improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in service requires the faculty member to:
    - a. Participate in service relevant to their discipline
    - b. Participate in service at the department college, university, discipline, and/or community engagement related to academic expertise
  3. Excellence (base plus merit) in service requires meeting all satisfactory criteria, in addition to two (2) of the following activities for tenured and tenure track faculty:
    - a. Leadership position on a committee at any level
    - b. Membership on a committee at the college or university level
    - c. Curriculum development and/or accreditation efforts related to administrative role and/or department priorities
    - d. Thesis, dissertation, comprehensive exam committee role
    - e. Peer reviewer for conferences, journals, grants
    - f. Editor/editorial board member for peer-reviewed journal
    - g. Membership/participation in a discipline-level committee
    - h. Membership on a discipline-specific advisory board or council
- G. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Clinical Faculty
1. Needs improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
  2. Satisfactory (base merit) in service requires the faculty member to incorporate activities that use one's clinical/professional expertise (based on criteria outlined in the *CHP Guidelines for Clinical Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion and Merit Document*):
    - a. Participate in service relevant to their discipline
    - b. Participate in service at the department college, university, discipline, and/or community engagement related to academic expertise
  3. Excellence (base plus merit) in service requires meeting all satisfactory criteria, in addition to two (2) of the following activities for clinical faculty:
    - a. Leadership position on a committee at any level
    - b. Membership on a committee at the college or university level
    - c. Curriculum development and/or accreditation efforts
    - d. Thesis, dissertation, comprehensive exam committee role
    - e. Peer reviewer for conferences, journals, grants
    - f. Editor/editorial board member for peer-reviewed journal
    - g. Membership/participation in a discipline-level committee
    - h. Community-based service contributions related to faculty role and in one's area of expertise
    - i. Participation in professional activities related to the faculty member's expertise (e.g. programs, consultations, boards or councils)
- H. Department of Kinesiology Standards for Merit in Service for Lecturer Faculty

1. Needs improvement in service denotes that the faculty member did not meet department standards for satisfactory service.
2. Satisfactory (base merit) in service requires the faculty member to participate in planning and orientation meetings, committee membership, engage in work with students beyond the classroom, and/or other activities as agreed upon with the department chair (based on criteria outlined in *02-01.05, Policy on the Employment of Lecturers*).
3. Excellence (base plus merit) in service requires meeting all satisfactory criteria, in addition to participation in at least one of the following activities:
  - a. Leadership position in a service activity
  - b. Membership and contributions to department, college, and/or university committees
  - c. Curriculum development and/or accreditation efforts
  - d. Peer reviewer for conferences, journals, grants
  - e. Community-based service contributions related to faculty role and in one's area of expertise
  - f. Participation in professional activities related to the faculty member's expertise (e.g. programs, consultations, boards or councils)

## APPENDIX A: CALENDAR

When	What	Who
<b>August</b>		
<b>Third Friday</b>	Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for work that was completed before June 1.	Faculty
<b>September</b>		
<b>First Friday</b>	Department Chairperson approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the Department Tenure and/or Promotion Committee.	Dept. Chair
<b>Third Friday</b>	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.	Faculty
<b>Third Friday</b>	College PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM committee (if necessary).	College PTRM
<b>Third Friday</b>	First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
<b>October</b>		
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department PTRM Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the Department Chairperson.	PTRM Chair
<b>Second Friday</b>	College PTRM documents are due to the University PTRM Committee if changes have been made.	College PTRM
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department PTRM documents are delivered to the College PTRM Committee if any changes have been made.	Dept. Chair PTRM Chair
<b>Fourth Friday</b>	The Department PTRM Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the Department Chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.	Chair PTRM Chair
<b>Oct 31st</b>	Peer observation of first year faculty are due.	Faculty
<b>November</b>		
<b>Second Friday</b>	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 (Appendix D); and, the written recommendation of the Department Chairperson, are forwarded by the Department PTRM Chairperson to the Dean's office.	PTRM Chair
<b>December</b>		
<b>Second Friday</b>	First-year faculty must submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
<b>Dec 15</b>	The College PTRM 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 PTRM
<b>January</b>		
<b>First Friday</b>	The Department PTRM Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year faculty are submitted to the Department Chairperson.	PTRM Chair
<b>Third Friday</b>	The Dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.	Dean

<b>Third Friday</b>	The Department PTRM Committee and Chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment and merit for first-year faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the Dean.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
<b>Third Friday</b>	All documentation for the third year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chairperson.	Faculty
<b>February</b>		
<b>First Friday</b>	Negative recommendations concerning reappointment and merit for first year faculty are delivered to the Department PTRM Committee.	Dept. Chair
<b>Second Friday</b>	Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the University PTRM Committee.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
<b>Second Friday</b>	Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
<b>March</b>		
<b>First Friday</b>	Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
<b>Second Friday</b>	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
<b>April</b>		
<b>Second Friday</b>	Election for a representative to the College PTRM Committee and their alternate for the upcoming academic year will be conducted. These members will serve a three-year term.	Department
<b>April 15</b>	First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the University President.	
<b>Third Friday</b>	Department PTRM Committees are formed	Department
<b>May</b>		
<b>First Friday</b>	Election for chair and/or vice chair of KNES PTRM Committee; College PTRM Committees are formed (elections for membership on the College committee are already completed).	Dept. PTRM
<b>June</b>		
<b>Third Friday</b>	All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the Department Chairperson	Faculty
<b>Third Friday</b>	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.	Dept. Chair Dept. PTRM Chair
<b>Third Friday</b>	All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by Chairperson and Dean of the written professional development plan.	Faculty

# APPENDIX B: ANNUAL REPORT FORMS

## ANNUAL REPORT (AR)

### Part I

Reporting On Activities For Academic Year

June 1, 20\_\_ - May 31, 20\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Rank \_\_\_\_\_

Department of \_\_\_\_\_

Area of Specialization \_\_\_\_\_

Appointed to TU faculty: at rank \_\_\_\_\_ in year \_\_\_\_\_.

Promotion History:

To rank \_\_\_\_\_ in year \_\_\_\_\_ ,

To rank \_\_\_\_\_ in year \_\_\_\_\_ , and

To rank \_\_\_\_\_ in year \_\_\_\_\_ .

I. Formal Degrees

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

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

II. Teaching

(percentage of workload: \_\_\_\_ %)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Community:

Profession:

University (all levels):

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

**ANNUAL REVIEW (AR)**

**Part II**

Agreement On Faculty Workload Expectations For Academic Year

June 1, 20\_\_ - May 31, 20\_\_

I. Teaching (percentage of workload: \_\_\_\_\_%)

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

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

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

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

II. Scholarship (percentage of workload: \_\_\_\_%)

III. Service (percentage of workload: \_\_\_\_%)

[For any of these activities which are part of your workload, please indicate.]

Community:

Profession:

University (all levels):

**SIGNATURES:**

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson of Department \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dean of College \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C: PEER OBSERVATION TEMPLATE

### 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 D: DEPARTMENT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION FORM

## 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
- Base Merit
- Base +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.