

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEES

Note to Faculty: For complete information on promotion and tenure policies, this document should be read together with the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy of Towson University and its appendices and the Policies and Procedures of the College of

2.

Committee for that year. In the event that no clinical faculty member in the Department of Psychology meets those requirements, a clinical faculty member from another department (with recommendation from the Chairperson of the other department) will be recruited by the PTRM Coordinator.

4. Merit Committee

The Merit Committee is responsible for annual decisions about merit. Psychology Department tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty who have completed at least three academic years at Towson University are eligible to serve on the Merit Commi

Following the election of the Reappointment and Tenure Committee Chairperson, the tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty of the Psychology Department shall elect the Merit Committee Chairperson and Secretary from among the members of that committee from the preceding year by simple majority vote. Election of the three remaining voting members and one alternate member of the Merit Committee shall occur immediately following election of the Merit Committee Chairperson and Secretary. The persons receiving the three highest number of votes shall become voting members of the Merit Committee (insuring one person at the Associate rank, one person at the Full professor rank, and, if possible, one person at the

Promotion Committee. In the case of any ties, a run-off vote shall be conducted to select that (those) person(s) with the highest number of votes. The committee members shall begin assuming their duties June 1 and shall serve a one year term. In the event that an alternate member permanently replaces a voting member of the Promotion Committee at a later time (when that individual is unable to carry out his or her duties), the Psychology Department shall elect a new alternate member of that committee at the earliest possible time.

II. POLICIES, DUTIES, AND PROCEDURES OF THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT PTRM COMMITTEES

A. The Psychology Department PTRM committees shall evaluate candidate files in relation to the standards and expectations established by the Towson University ART policy, the criteria of the College of Liberal Arts, and the criteria of the Psychology Department.

B. Quorum: A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members.

C. Voting Procedures

Upon completion of the discussion of each candidate all votes regarding tenure or promotion shall be by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID

member being evaluated, the department name or college name, and the date. Members of the committee will each sign the report to confirm their participation and the result as recorded. The committee chair shall forward this signed, dated report of the results of the vote and committee's recommendations to the Dean. Faculty who are absent may not vote by proxy (e.g., on sabbatical, at a conference, sick). (Faculty on sabbatical may vote if they have reviewed the material and are present at the meeting). No committee member shall abstain from a vote for tenure or promotion unless the Provost authorizes such abstention based for good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.

Upon completion of discussion of each candidate, all votes regarding reappointment, merit, and/or comprehensive reviews shall be by confidential ballot and tallied by the committee chair. The results shall be entered on a single sheet of paper labeled with the name of the faculty member being evaluated, the departments

review, reappointment, and merit (“not meritorious” – see section II.H.2.i -- being the only merit judgment considered to be a negative judgment), if the appeal is on substantive grounds. Substantive appeals refer to perceived errors in judgment by the department committee or chair in evaluating the faculty member's performance.

All appeals shall be made in writing. The faculty member shall have 21 calendar days from the date that a negative judgment is delivered in person or the date of the postmark of a certified letter to file an appeal. The appeal must clearly state in writing the grounds for the appeal and must be accompanied by supporting documents. The faculty member may supplement the evaluation portfolio under consideration with any statement, evidence, or other documents believed to present a more valid perspective on performance. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair and the chair of the appropriate PTRM committee.

Faculty members may also submit procedural appeals to the university PTRM committee, or appeals alleging unlawful discrimination, as provided for in the university ART policy, Appendix 3, and Towson University policy 06-01.00.

G. Evaluation Procedures

1. General Policies and Procedures

- a. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review,

c. For every type of evaluation, including annual review, the faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that s/he has read, but not necessarily agreed with the evaluation. However, failure to sign shall not prevent the documentation from being forwarded to the next evaluation level.

2. Annual Review for Merit

a. The Merit Committee shall annually review

g. The department chairperson shall meet with that faculty member to discuss the

4. Reappointment: Second Year Faculty and Annual Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

- a. The Psychology Department follows the procedures for the reappointment of second-year faculty laid out in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, section III.D.3.a-g.
- b. Evaluation procedures for annual reappointment for Clinical Faculty after their first-year of appointment shall be the same as the evaluation procedures for reappointment of second-year faculty set forth in the University ART Policy, Appendix 3, section III.D.3.a-g., except that the Clinical Evaluation Committee shall be substituted for the Reappointment and Tenure Committee. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will follow the Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit.

5. Reappointment of third through fifth year faculty

- a. USM Policy II-1.00 Section I.C.3. provides that the appointments of faculty entering the third through fifth years of service will automatically renew for one additional year unless notice of non-reappointment is provided by August 1 prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service as applicable.

6. Third-Year Review

- a. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the Tenure Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates to assess progress toward tenure and to advise and mentor the faculty member. This includes providing assistance where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. Reappointment and Tenure Committee evaluations of a candidate's interim progress

will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the CLA dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTRM committee or the Provost. b. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the Reappointment and Tenure committee as outlined in the section "Documentation and Material Inclusion" (Section I.B) of Appendix 3 of The Towson University ART policy. c. The Reappointment and Tenure Committee will evaluate the 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 and other relevant criteria. This statement:

(i) must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is likely to lead towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and

(ii) must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:

(i) Superior progress. Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.

(ii) Satisfactory progress. Requirements include progress towards

excellenceT 50 0& 1 Tf (1.2.24 12 58/TT2 1 Tf (96Tj ET Q Q q /Cs1 D92 cm#[(e) 450

(iii)

c. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Communication of negative recommendations shall follow the procedures outlined in section II.F.3 of this document.

d. The Psychology Department PTRM Coordinator shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation

c. The department chairperson shall prepare an independent evaluation of each faculty member considered for promotion and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio by the fourth Friday in October.

d. All recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the faculty member, inclusive of any department chairperson's statement and a record of the vote count no later than the fourth Friday in October. Communication of negative recommendations shall follow the procedures outlined in section II.F.3 of this document.

e. The Psychology Department PTRM Coordinator shall forward the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the Evaluation Record to the dean's office by the second Friday in November.

9. Three Year Appointment for Clinical Faculty

a. Upon request by the Clinical Faculty member, Clinical Faculty at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and higher may be considered for a three-year contract. The Clinical Evaluation Committee will follow procedures set forth in the Policy for Clinical Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Merit.

10. Comprehensive Five-Year Review (Post-tenure Review)

a. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five (5) academic years.

b. The Promotion Committee shall review the evaluation portfolios of faculty members standing for their Comprehensive Five-Year Review and prepare a written report with recommendation and vote count.

There are two options for the voting: meets expectations or does not meet expectations. Recommendations shall contain reference to each category evaluated including teaching/advising, scholarship and university /civic/ professional service, and should be submitted to the department chairperson by the second Friday in October.

c. The chair of the department, in consultation with the CLA dean

&#*

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 and dean. The plan shall be implemented in the fall semester following its approval.

H. Review and Changes to Document.

D. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio if the University creates an approved format for doing so). Binders should be organized using dividers with tabs to identify the sections (electronic portfolios should be organized with similar clarity, based on University standards once developed and using the technologies available). Although the faculty member has freedom to include materials deemed pertinent to the evaluation, repetitious or padded files are discouraged. Contents of the evaluation portfolio are determined by type of review and minimally, shall include:

1. Evaluation portfolio materials for annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - a. completed and signed AR (Annual Report Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) forms.
 - b. current *curriculum vitae*. The *curriculum vitae* should summarize the candidate's education, teaching, and

- (ii) grade distributions for courses tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
- e. documentation of scholarship (Clinical Faculty:

- a. all of the above items listed in D.1.
 - b. peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator(s).
3. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
 - a. all materials listed above in D.1. and D.2. from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.
 - b. a narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he or she has met and integrated teaching, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreements for the period under review.
4. If confidential external reviews are solicited pursuant to departmental or college promotion and tenure policies, they will remain confidential and will not be made available to the faculty member. These reviews will not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but will be forwarded under separate cover to each subsequent level of review.
5. If the faculty member or the chairperson participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to his/her file rebutting or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the evaluation portfolio in a special section entitled ! Information Added. All documentation used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio no later than November 30.
6. If the chairperson participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other

than his/her evaluation, 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.

Solicited external reviews will not be added to the evaluation portfolio but will be forwarded under separate cover to each level of review. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be maintained. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

" Summary of student evaluations across the evaluation period. Faculty using university evaluation forms should submit the summary of results for each course received from the assessment office. Those using departmental forms should compile the data in a format that will allow analysis of trends over time

" A narrative statement about individual teaching and/or advising philosophy and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.

" Peer teaching evaluations.

Section IV

" Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Section V

" Recommendations (to be added by the appropriate party at the appropriate stage).

" Written recommendation of the department Promotion Committee and/or reappointment and tenure committee, including the Departmental Summary Recommendation form.

- G. Peer evaluations are a required part of the review process. The procedures and guidelines to be utilized when evaluating the teaching of Psychology Faculty are presented in Appendix B.

- H. Upon request of the faculty member, external evaluations may be

2. A faculty member shall be committed to collegiality and academic citizenship. ! Collegiality and academic citizenship refer to the role and responsibility of faculty in shared decision making through open and fair processes devised to provide timely advice and recommendations on matters that relate to curriculum, academic personnel, and the educational functions of the institution. The demonstration of high standards of humane, ethical, and professional behavior is fundamental to collegiality and academic citizenship. These concepts include mutual respect for similarities and differences among participants on the basis of background, expertise, opinions, and assigned responsibilities. Collegiality does not imply agreement; vibrant university communities must include the capacity for respectful disagreement among faculty members and administrators.
3. A faculty member shall share the responsibility of university, college, and/or department governance. Faculty members must make themselves available to participate in the work of the department, of assigned committees, or of college and university processes in which faculty play an essential part (admissions activities and graduation could stand as examples of such wider processes).
4. A faculty member shall participate each year in the faculty evaluation process as described in university, college, and department documents. Satisfactory participation includes the full completion of the Annual Review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTRM calendar.

- C. The evaluation of teaching should consider classroom performance as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching, and the faculty role in both formal and informal advising. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom. Teaching as a sphere of evaluation includes the use of technology, the 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, attention to pedagogy connected with the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It includes as well service as an assigned academic advisor, advising through student groups, and informal advising of departmental majors or students in any professional context.
- D. The evaluation of teaching and advising shall be based on materials provided in the evaluation portfolio. The assessment of teaching and advising effectiveness will give close attention to (1) the faculty member's self-evaluation in the reflective statements included in the portfolio, (2) syllabi and other teaching materials presented by the faculty member, (3) student evaluations, (4) peer evaluations, (5) the evaluation of student learning outcomes for the faculty member's courses where possible, (6) the faculty member's presentation of evidence of effective advising, , and (7) the judgment of faculty teaching performance made by prior evaluating bodies (e.g. Reappointment & Tenure Committee).
1. Self-evaluation and course materials
 - a. The faculty member's evaluation of his/her own teaching effectiveness will include a narrative statement covering teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching strategies and efficacy. This statement should

highlight any evidence in the materials of the portfolio to which the faculty member wishes to call attention and should contain an interpretation of student, peer, and chair evaluations as appropriate.

- b. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation are parts of the required Annual Review reports and are included in the evaluation portfolio. Syllabi should convey to students a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and should contain those elements as specified for course syllabi in university policy.
 - c. Faculty may choose to include in evaluation portfolios assessment outcomes related directly to the faculty member's work or copies of assignments that demonstrate creativity, high expectations, community engagement, effective educational practices, or other qualities the faculty member wishes to place in consideration.
 - d. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages, shall be made available to faculty members for review and shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio. These reports should be considered in relation to standards expressed in departmental or college objectives, the faculty member's self-evaluation, course syllabi, and the evaluations of students and peers.
2. Evaluation of teaching by students
- a. Student evaluations of instruction, both the quantitative summaries and the qualitative statements by students, are a required part of the evaluation of faculty.

- b. Student evaluation reports shall be tabulated by the office of the department chairperson or an administrative entity other than the faculty member.
 - c. Tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty shall be evaluated for all courses taught. This includes all on-load, off-load, online, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms. However, it does not include individual-level instruction like thesis, independent investigations, and proctoring courses.
 - 3. Evaluation of teaching by peers
 - a. Classroom or teaching site visits are encouraged for purposes of professional growth and are required when the faculty member is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and five-year comprehensive review.
 - b. The procedures and guidelines to be utilized when evaluating the teaching of tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty in the Psychology Department are presented in Appendix B.
 - c. The department PTRM Coordinator in conjunction with the Assistant Chair of the Psychology Department will arrange the peer evaluations to ensure that all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty have the required number of peer evaluations.
 - d. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
 - 4. Evaluation of advising

- a. Faculty academic advisors assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their academic or professional goals. The faculty academic advisor provides assistance in refining goals and objectives, understanding available choices, and assessing the consequences of alternative courses of action.
 - b. Advising may also include guidance of students in the learning process within one's class-teaching responsibilities, advising groups in academic honor societies, serving on graduate research committees, or advising students formally or informally in other professional contexts.
 - c. Statements of advising experience and practice and any materials evidencing engagement with advising responsibilities should be included in the evaluation portfolio. The faculty member's presentation of evidence of effective advising could include logs of advising appointments, notable instances of advising contributions or innovations, a list of the number of letters of recommendation written on behalf of students, research mentoring beyond the expectations of course supervision, or student evaluations of advising.
- E. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in his/her academic field, as

affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. For Clinical Faculty, instead of traditional scholarship, the Clinical Faculty evaluation will be based on demonstrated administrative ability/accomplishments including such things as proficiency in enhancing/developing administrative procedures to advance the department, leadership associated with departmental initiatives, and community engagement and collaboration.

1. The major forms of scholarship may be defined as follows:
 - a) **Scholarship of Application** – applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university,
 - b) **Scholarship of Discovery** – traditional research, knowledge for its own sake,
 - c) **Scholarship of Integration** – applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines,
 - d) **Scholarship of Teaching** – the systematic examination of strategies used to facilitate and evaluate student learning.

2. The quality and value of the scholarship shall be subject to the professional judgment of the members of the Psychology PTRM committees, who may consider such things as the audience of the journals or conferences, the rigor of the peer review process, reviews, scholarly accomplishment, or other outside evidence of the quality of the work.

3. Whatever type(s) of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or

promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. In presenting scholarly materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues. A faculty member's portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a pattern of completed work consistent with the nature of the faculty member's appointment.

4. Scholarly work accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Such scholarly work may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews. They may

- F. The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the proportion of time allocated for service in the faculty member's workload agreements. To the extent possible, evaluation should consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of membership on a committee or a position held. The faculty member should sufficiently explain the type or substance of service outside the university to allow colleagues a reasonable basis for judgment of its extent and its relation to the mission of the university.

dealings with students governed by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Program directors who supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to such work under their workload agreements.

H. The expectations for reappointment are as follows:

1. The tenure-track or clinical faculty member meets departmental standards and expectations or shows potential for future improvement.
2. If the tenure-track faculty member does not show satisfactory progress towards tenure or the clinical faculty member does not meet departmental standards and expectations or show potential for future improvement, he or she shall be given the reasons in writing.

I. The expectations for advancement to tenure are as follows:

1. The tenure-track faculty member must, in the judgment of the members of the Reappointment and Tenure Committee, have met the Psychology Department's standards and expectations (IV above), including teaching and advising effectiveness consistent with department norms, sustained and substantial scholarly

activity, and service to the University and the department in

substituted for the departmental promotion committee, c.)

Departmental standards and expectations for Clinical Faculty shall
be substituted for departmental standards and expectations for

- iii. Grade distribution reports shall be included.
- iv. Student evaluations of teaching, including on-load, off-load, on-line, traditional classroom, and hybrid courses taught during the academic year, minimester, and summer terms that indicate acceptable evaluations considering the nature and

ii. The faculty member's portfolio provides evidence

a department who can receive Base Merit plus one Performance Merit. Faculty who are evaluated as Excellent are characterized by the following:

a. Teaching and advising.

- i. The faculty member's evaluation of his/her own teaching and advising effectiveness will include a narrative statement indicating the faculty member's teaching philosophy and a reflective consideration of teaching and advising strategies and efficacy. This narrative should also include the development of new courses, as appropriate, that serve the needs of the department, college and/or university.
- ii. Syllabi for all courses during the period of evaluation should include a clear overview of course objectives, requirements, and expectations and contain all elements specified for course syllabi in university policy.

characteristics of the course, the grade distribution reports for the course, and the narrative comments of the faculty member regarding the course. The narrative statements might describe development and implementation of specific strategies for continual enhancement of courses to reflect current knowledge related to those courses.

- v. Peer evaluations of teaching indicate excellent classroom performance; comprehensive syllabi; and incorporation of instructional technology, appropriate and effective testing, and evaluation and grading of students.
- vi. The faculty academic advisor should be available to assist students with academic and/or professional questions and provide students with information

3. publishing a significant article in a peer reviewed journal;
 4. obtaining a significant external grant or contract; and/or serving as editor or associate editor of a journal (alternatively this may be considered as service)
- ii. Faculty are encouraged to provide data on the significance of their research such as the impact factor or acceptance rate of journals in which they have been published, or other data that would substantiate the significance of their scholarship.
- c. Service
- i. Demonstration of involvement in faculty governance either through a leadership role on an active committee or through membership on a variety of committees at the departmental, college, University and/or profession/civic level.
 - ii. The faculty member should clarify in the appropriate narrative the responsibilities of the service both in terms of frequency of meetings as well as number of hours of required work.
3. Not Meritorious – Faculty member’s failure to meet any of the standards noted in I.1. may be a basis for not meeting expectations.

V. CALENDAR

The Psychology Department will abide by the Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar as published in Appendix 3 of the ART policy. The calendar is included in this document as Appendix A with the understanding

that if the published university calendar changes, the Psychology calendar may change without formal amendment of the Psychology Policies and Procedures document.

Approved by the Psychology Department 12/15/2015

Appendix A

Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Comprehensive Review Calendar

The first Friday in May

Department and college PTRM committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

The Third Friday in June

All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio to the department chair.

A. 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.

B. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.

August 1 (USM mandated)

Tenure-track faculty in the third or later academic year of service must be notified in writing of non-reappointment prior to the third or subsequent academic year of service if

B. The college PTRM committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.

C. The department PTRM committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.

**Appendix B – Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Psychology Department Policies and Procedures for Promotion, Tenure,
Reappointment and Merit**

- I. This appendix is likely to undergo 0 0 46 1 cm BT cm BTB

examples to illustrate key concepts, made use of visual aids that could be understood, effectively utilized technology such as Blackboard, provided outlines and/or handouts, presented informative videos or computerized instruction, concluded by summarizing main ideas, etc.

c. Classroom Environment

Assess the quality of the classroom environment. This analysis might address the extent to which the instructor encouraged student engagement, incorporated student responses in the class discussions, maintained good rapport with students, etc.

2. Strengths and Constructive Feedback

Describe the instructor's strengths and provide any constructive feedback. Peer evaluations should include both strengths and at least one suggestion for course enhancement. Provide evidence with examples.

3. Course Planning and Assignment Evaluation

a. Evaluate the syllabi, textbook and/or readings, assignments, and/or special projects, examinations, student feedback and grading methods.

b. On-line courses are assessed in reference to the Quality Matters document from OTS.

II. The Written Summary will be sent to the observed faculty, and the observer and the observed will review and discuss the summary. The observed faculty member will sign the Written Summary indicating the observed has read the summary. The observed faculty member may write a response to be attached to the observation.

III. The Written Summary will be taken into consideration in the evaluation of teaching by the appropriate PTRM committees during deliberations.

IV. Any tenured faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion to full professor must request to be observed in the previous academic year.