

Department of Electronic Media and Film

Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment

Revised April 2026

Table of Contents

I.	General Principles.....	Page 2
II.	Committee Structure.....	Page 3
III.	Method of Selection.....	Page 4
IV.	Policies and Procedures.....	Page 4
V.	Workload.....	Page 10
VI.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching & Advising.....	Page 11
VII.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Scholarship.....	Page 13
VIII.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Service.....	Page 17
IX.	Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review.....	Page 19
X.	Procedures for Third-Year Review of Untenured Faculty.....	Page 19
XI.	Procedures for Adding Information.....	Page 20
XII.	PTR Calendar.....	Page 22
XIII.	Appendix A (Policy on Teaching Evaluations).....	Page 27
XIV.	Appendix B (Peer Evaluation Form).....	Page 30

Department of Electronic Media and Film – Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment

I. General Principles

- A. Board of Regents minimum requirements for appointment, promotion, and tenure are established by the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents and are stated in the "II-1.00 University System of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty," (<http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II100.html>) which may be amended from time to time. The provisions of the USM policy supersede any conflicting provisions in Towson University policies. The Towson University policies, COFAC policies, and EMF policies are consistent with the USM policies.

B. Standards and Expectations

The Towson University policies on appointment, rank, and tenure and faculty workload and responsibilities provide the basis for standards and expectations common to all full or part-time tenure track faculty. The tenure and/or promotion decision is based both on the needs of the university and the competence and quality of the individual.

All faculty are responsible for meeting University standards and expectations, including but not limited to those listed in this section. Meeting the general expectations specified below is essential for a faculty member's performance to be judged satisfactory in an annual review or, cumulatively, across a longer period of evaluation.

Common standards and expectations for all faculty include the following activities:

1. A faculty member shall fulfill their workload agreement in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, shall be available for consultation and advising during office hours, and shall meet all classes as scheduled.
2. A faculty member shall be an effective teacher both in and out of the classroom.
3. A faculty member shall be committed to a discipline or interdisciplinary specialty and shall be committed to continuing professional development and demonstration of scholarly growth.

4. A 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.

5. 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).
6. 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 annual review forms and submission of the forms signed and accompanied by all documents required no later than the due date specified in the PTR calendar.

C. College

A faculty member is responsible for meeting the standards and expectations of the College of Fine Arts and Communication.

D. Department

A faculty member is responsible for meeting the standards and expectations of the Department of Electronic Media and Film, as outlined below.

II. **Committee Structure**

- A. Tenure/Reappointment Committee: all tenured faculty within the Department with at least one year of full-time service.
- B. Third-Year Review, Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review, Rank, and Merit-Appeal Committees: same as Tenure/Reappointment Committee.

- C. The Tenure/Reappointment, Merit-Appeal, Third-Year Review and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committees will hereafter be referred to as the EMF PTR Committee.
- D. A quorum for the PTR Committee shall be 50% or more of the eligible members. However, in all cases at least 3 committee members must be present.
- E. The Department chair shall not be a voting member of the department PTR Committee.

III. **Method of Selection**

- A. The chair of the PTR Committee shall be elected every three years by vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. This person shall have general oversight over the process of Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, in coordination with the Department chair. Specifically, the PTR chair shall be responsible for convening, chairing, and reporting the results of all PTR Committee meetings; creating a schedule and collecting the results of all peer evaluations within EMF; coordinating the revision of EMF PTR Documents; and advising full-time faculty about the Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit, Third Year Review, and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review process.
- B. The PTR Committee must have at least three members in each committee. If less than three faculty members are available within EMF, an additional faculty member or members shall be chosen following the process outlined in the University ART document.
- C. The PTR chair and the Department chair are responsible for filling out the Department Summary Recommendation Form.
- D. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave are welcome to serve and vote on the PTR Committee, providing they can attend all meetings.

IV. **Policies and Procedures**

- A. All faculty, tenured and tenure-track, are responsible for creating a portfolio of effective teaching, advising, research/creative/professional work, and service to be submitted to the department chair by the annual review deadline. Evaluation portfolios shall be turned in digitally, following formatting instructions provided by the department, college, and university.

B. Materials needed for faculty review process:

1. Annual review of all full-time faculty must include:
 - a. Updated curriculum vitae
 - b. Annual Workload Plan (AR 2 form) or Chairs Annual Workload Plan
 - c. Annual Report (AR 1 form) or Chairs Annual Report (for the year under review)
 - d. All available student evaluations for the period under review
 - e. Any peer observations received during the review period
 - f. Syllabi of courses taught during the review period

2. Portfolio materials for third-year review and for full review for promotion and/or tenure must include:
 - a. all materials listed above in B.1 from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.
 - b. Sample of Research or Creative Activity: a copy or link to one recent peer-reviewed publication or description of a comparable creative activity.
 - c. Summary of Student Evaluations across the evaluation period, focusing on use of student feedback to reflect upon teaching and noting any changes or improvements made in response to student evaluations. Quantitative student evaluation data summarized by reporting averages of instructor-related questions.
 - d. Statement of teaching philosophy and an interpretation of student and peer evaluations.
 - e. Supporting Statement: Summary statement describing correlation between expectations and accomplishments and integrating accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement must clearly articulate the faculty member's line of scholarly endeavors and describe their expected and continuing trajectory as a scholar.

3. Evaluation portfolio materials for five-year comprehensive post-tenure review of all tenured faculty must include:
 - a. All materials listed above in B.1 and B.2 for all five (5) years
 - b. At least two peer evaluations of teaching, at least three semesters apart, with at least one from the two years preceding the review
 - c. A statement outlining goals and expected career development plans in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service for the upcoming five-year period. This can be part of the Supporting Statement (B.2.e.) or submitted as an additional document.

4. Evaluation portfolio materials for promotion of lecturers must include:
 - a. All materials listed above in B.1 for the review period

- b. Record of at least six years teaching full-time at an accredited university for promotion to Lecturer II and at least ten years for Lecturer III
- c. Documentation in the above materials (or with supplementary materials) of:
 - i. teaching excellence across the evaluation period (e.g., peer evaluations, student feedback, and reflections on teaching)
 - ii. sustained record of scholarship activities with workload identified in Annual Plans
 - iii. sustained record of service activities commensurate with workload identified in Annual Plans
- d. See Towson University's 02-01.05 – Policy on the Appointment, Rank and Promotion of Lecturers for more information

C. Significance of the AR part 2 or SENTF document:

All faculty are expected to meet university and departmental standards for teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. However, the AR part 2 or SENTF document describes the expected percentage or "weighting" of these three areas in the individual faculty member's work. This weighting is an important factor in reappointment, tenure, promotion, third-year review, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure review.

D. Schedule and Methods of Evaluation:

Tenure Track faculty members' performance is evaluated on an annual basis, in the middle of their third year, and during their mandatory tenure-review year sixth year of service.

The "Mandatory Tenure-Review Year" is specified in the faculty member's contract, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the University and the faculty member. Typically, the "Mandatory Tenure-Review Year" will be the faculty member's sixth year of continuous, full-time service, and an assistant professor must receive a tenure review no later than the sixth year of continuous full-time employment in that rank. However, a faculty member may request review for tenure and promotion prior to the Mandatory Tenure-Review Year if they have demonstrated outstanding performance in teaching/advising or scholarship or University/civic/professional services, validated at the national level, and satisfactory or better performance in other performance categories.

If a faculty member's mandatory tenure-review year is negotiated to be prior to the sixth year of continuous, full-time service, the standard Annual Review by the EMF department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the EMF department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

A faculty member reviewed for tenure prior to the Mandatory Tenure-Review Year who is denied at the department or college level may withdraw his/her application for tenure before submission to the next level. The withdrawal must be set forth in a writing directed to the department PTRM committee, in which event the next tenure and promotion review will occur in the Mandatory Tenure-Review Year specified in the original faculty contract.

Evaluations will be based primarily upon the faculty member's documentation of their professional activities by way of the faculty evaluation portfolio. However, the methods by which the EMF PTR Committee evaluate colleagues' professional contributions should not be too rigidly defined and consider each portfolio on an individual basis. Evaluation is based on the wholeness of an individual's teaching, scholarship, and service portfolio over the entire review period.

E. Decisions

Faculty members being evaluated shall be informed in writing of committee decisions by the dates set out in the PTR Calendar.

First year faculty should be informed in writing of the department chair's decision.

Additionally, the committee chair or another committee member may be delegated to discuss specific issues with a faculty member being evaluated.

- F. The EMF chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. The EMF chairperson shall prepare an independent recommendation of each faculty member considered for promotion and/or tenure and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- G. Negative decisions should be delivered in person by the EMF chairperson (or designee), electronically through the File Delivery Service (or other appropriately confidential method), or sent confidentially through the File Delivery Service to the candidate by the date described in the PTR Calendar.
- H. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit appeals, and/or five-year comprehensive post-tenure reviews taken by any committee and/or the department shall be by secret ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the committee chair.

The committee chair shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The

secret ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but retained by the EMF Office until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the university. 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.

- I. Tie votes: A majority vote is necessary for Tenure, Promotion or Reappointment. For merit appeals, a tie vote shall result in recommendation of merit.
- J. A faculty member may add a written response or rebuttal to any document in their file. See "Appeals and Rebuttals" and "Procedures for Adding Information."
- K. **Appeals and Rebuttals**

- 1. Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Appeals: There are three kinds of appeals/rebuttals in the PTR process: substantive, procedural, and rebuttals alleging discrimination. For a full discussion of appeals, see the ART document.
 - a. Rebuttals of substantive matters for Department decisions on Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review should go to the COFAC dean's office for the COFAC PTR Committee and be copied to the department chair and the department's PTR chair. Rebuttals must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal, and must be accompanied by supporting documents.

Rebuttals must be delivered through confidential electronic communication like the File Delivery Service, or in person to the college dean within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

- b. Procedural appeals shall be made to the university PTRM Committee. The appeal must be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural error(s). The appeal shall be accompanied by supporting documents and should be delivered through confidential electronic communication like the File Delivery Service or in person to the UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of having been notified of the negative recommendation. Appeals of department recommendations shall be copied to the department chair, the department PTR chair, the dean, and the university PTRM Committee chair.

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

L. Revision and Approval of this PTR Document

EMF PTR documents pertaining to standards, criteria, and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the PTR Committee.

1. The EMF PTR document must be distributed to all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department for input at least five (5) business days prior to the EMF PTR Committee vote on the document.
2. Final approval at the department level shall be by a simple majority vote of the tenured/tenure-track faculty of the department. Excepting faculty who are on leave from the university (e.g., medical, sabbatical, etc.), the signature of each tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the department will signify that they have voted on the department PTR documents.
3. Prior to submission to the university PTRM Committee, the department document, with Approval Form, should be submitted to the college PTR committee and the dean of the college for approval by the first Friday in December.
4. Following approval by the college PTR Committee and the dean, the department PTR document should be delivered by the dean to the chairperson of the university PTRM Committee by the second Friday in February.
5. The department PTR Committee shall formally respond to changes and/or recommendations resulting from the review by the university PTRM Committee and submit a revised copy to the college PTR Committee and the dean of the college for approval prior to the due date specified by the university PTRM Committee.
6. The chairperson of each department is responsible for assuring that the approved departmental PTR documents are posted on the Towson University website.
7. The department shall review its PTR document every three years, at a minimum, and submit evidence of such review to the dean of the College and the university PTRM Committee.
8. All policies at the department/program level shall remain in effect until changed according to the procedures described herein. Faculty members shall be evaluated

for tenure pursuant to the departmental PTR standards and criteria in effect during the year they are first appointed to a tenure-track position.

- M. Confidentiality—Members of the committee will maintain strict confidentiality concerning its deliberations and recommendations at all points during and after the process, with the exception of the information provided to candidates or departments by the chair or the dean in performance of their duties under the ART policy.

V. **Workload**

- A. EMF values the unique attributes each faculty member brings to the department and recognizes that a healthy and vibrant academic program relies on faculty diversity and that this diversity is reflected in a variety of workload agreements. Faculty members will choose, in consultation with and approval by the department chair, appropriate percentages of teaching, scholarship, and service dependent upon activities determined annually.
- B. There are three typical teaching workloads in the EMF Department: 4/4, 4/3, and 3/3. The chair's workload is different from these workloads; it stresses leadership.
 1. Faculty on a 4/4 load are teachers/scholars, with 75% of their time devoted to teaching. They are required to do research/creative/professional work, and to disseminate it to appropriate venues for peer review/professional recognition, but their evaluations will be based primarily on teaching and service.
 2. Faculty on a 4/3 load should have a balanced profile of teaching, scholarship/creative/professional activity (including dissemination to respected venues for peer review/professional recognition) and service, with 70% of their time devoted to teaching. Their evaluations will be based on this balanced profile.
 3. Faculty on a 3/3 load are scholars/teachers, with 65% of their time devoted to teaching. They are expected to have an ongoing program of high-quality scholarship/creative/professional activity (including dissemination to prestigious venues for peer review/professional recognition). Their evaluations will place much more emphasis on scholarship than the other workloads. Teaching remains very important, and there must be effective service.

4. The most important merit criterion for the chair is evaluation of their leadership of the Department. Teaching, research/creative/professional activity, and service must also be considered.
5. If a faculty member's workload varies significantly from the profiles discussed above, the EMF chair and the EMF PTR Committee will develop written standards specifically for that faculty member.

VI. **Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching and Advising**

A. Teaching – takes a variety of forms, including the use of technology, development of new courses and programs (including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement), faculty exchanges and teaching abroad, off-site learning, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation, emphasis on pedagogy, including the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum, and other aspects of learning and its assessment. It also includes advising responsibilities. See Appendix A for specific details on Teaching Evaluations.

1. Standards and expectations for **reappointment**:
 - a. Knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field
 - b. Refinement, updating, and improvement of courses that one teaches
 - c. Effective and successful participation in course and program development that is based on established scholarship, best practice, and/or one's sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
 - d. Demonstrated leadership in course and program development
 - 1) Carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi
 - 2) Expertise and currency in the content of one's teaching
 - 3) Availability to students
 - 4) Strong evidence of potential for meeting the standards for tenure at the time of the tenure decision
2. Standards for **promotion to Assistant Professor**:
 - a. The standards for reappointment
 - b. Advising (see VI B below)
3. Standards for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:
 - a. The standards for reappointment
 - b. Effective teaching, as evidenced by:
 - 1) Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation, and grading of students' performance

- 2) Incorporation of appropriate instructional technology in one's teaching
 - 3) Content of courses and teaching processes are supportive of department mission
 - 4) Responsiveness to cultural and individual difference
 - 5) Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation
 - 6) Effective instruction as measured by student evaluation
 - 7) Recognition in the department and the College of the quality of one's teaching
 - 8) Other evidence put forward by the faculty member
4. Standards for **promotion to Professor**:
- a. The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
 - b. Excellence in teaching
 - c. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching
5. Standards for **Excellent as opposed to Satisfactory Teaching**. There is no one measure that defines Excellent Teaching. Instead, excellent teaching should be outstanding in the majority of the following areas and satisfactory in the others:
- a. Knowledge of current and emerging needs in one's field
 - b. Use of appropriate technology in one's teaching
 - c. Construction of effective syllabi and assignments
 - d. Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation and grading of students' performance
 - e. Responsiveness to cultural and individual difference
 - f. Excellent instruction as measured by peer evaluation
 - g. Excellent instruction as measured by quantitative student evaluation—typically at least 4.0 in a scale of 1-5 (note: because of current low participation rates, this measure is not very reliable)
 - h. Excellent instruction as measured by qualitative student comments (note: because of current low participation rates, this measure is not very reliable)
 - i. A thoughtful approach to teaching as evidenced by the candidate's reflective essay (a required part of the PTR dossier)
 - j. Excellent advising as measured by student evaluations (as these are implemented by the department) and by the informal observations of one's peers
6. These additional criteria for Excellent Teaching are not required of every faculty member, but they do enhance a teaching portfolio:

- a. Instruction and mentoring of students who have gone on to success in EMF-related fields
 - b. High-quality participation in department, college, and university-wide assessment efforts
 - c. Awards and other forms of recognition for quality teaching
- B. Advising – Towson University considers advising an important faculty responsibility.

Standards and expectations for all full-time faculty (does not include 1st year full-time faculty):

1. Accessible to students for advising sessions
2. Schedule formal advising hours each semester
3. Be familiar with transfer policies, ARTSYS, and the department’s website
4. Assist students with the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their professional goals
5. Assist students with course planning (understand curriculum, policies, and procedures; assess objectives and available choices; explore alternative courses of action)
6. Mentor and evaluate student scholarship and creative activity
7. When possible, advise academic honor societies and other student groups, and serve on graduate research committees

VII. Departmental Standards and Expectations for Scholarship

Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration and/or Teaching. Regardless of type, each faculty member shall be reviewed in terms of continuing professional development, an active and sustained program of scholarly/creative activity consistent with their appointment, and currency in their academic field as affirmed by its community of scholars.

The EMF PTR Committee looks at peer review and dissemination as ways to validate a candidate’s scholarship and/or creative activity. In presenting scholarly/creative materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan if the form or site of publication or the means of dissemination is not familiar to departmental colleagues.

The committee makes distinctions between local, regional, and national/international dissemination of research. A faculty member who speaks or performs only on campus will not receive the highest level of evaluation. On the other hand, some “local” venues

are also of the very highest quality – e.g., a performance at the Kennedy Center, or a book published by Johns Hopkins University Press.

The committee understands that scholarship and/or creative activity take time. A year that is spent researching and/or creating a larger work, but not yet finalizing and disseminating the piece, needs to be notated by the faculty member with a reasonable expectation of the dissemination timeline.

The committee recognizes that the Boyer model – Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Teaching – aptly describes the broad range of appropriate scholarship at Towson University.

Scholarship of Application: applying knowledge to consequential problems, either internal or external to the university, and including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.

Scholarship of Discovery: traditional research, knowledge for its own sake, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.

Scholarship of Integration: applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.

Scholarship of Teaching: exploring ideas, methods and technologies that improve teaching and learning. Disseminating this work to relevant publics via articles, presentations, media productions, websites, etc.

A. **Appropriate kinds of scholarship and creative activity**

Because EMF involves disciplines that include many fields, the following list of activities presents the more obvious forms (but not every possible form) in which scholarship/creative activity will be demonstrated:

1. Productions: writing, producing, directing, editing, camera, sound, music, other technical work for film, video, radio, audio, lectures, software, Internet multimedia/digital projects, animation, and programming for: corporate, TV, and community.
2. Publication: articles, books, book chapters, reviews, conference papers, scripts (for produced and unproduced work), lectures, workshops; including Internet publication on the history/theory/criticism of electronic media, film, digital arts, and related media including peer reviewer, editor, and/or adjudicator for publications.

3. Exhibitions: film festivals, tours, screenings, installations, multimedia performance, museum, gallery, including curation.
 4. Distribution: theatrical, broadcast, cable, Internet, film/video/audio sales, film/video/audio rental, corporate/institutional distribution (e.g., for industrials).
 5. Academic preparation: conference attendance, degrees, courses, workshops, and technical/course pedagogy. This professional development is considered a secondary level of scholarship.
 6. Media and/or arts-related festivals, screenings, events, academic or professional conferences: Curating, programming, leadership involvement, significant judging/jurying or adjudication, visiting artist, guest lecturer at internal or external sites, roles including panel chair, panel member, or respondent.
 7. Management of radio/TV/Cable/Web stations or of Media Labs is considered primarily a service function. There is the opportunity for scholarship applications such as technical expertise and implementation, research, presentations, papers, etc. including on management practices, programming, FCC regulations, new generations of equipment, equipment upgrades, facilities/labs redesign, and production and post-production workflow.
- B. On a department-wide basis, these forms of scholarship are considered equally valid "scholarship" activities for reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion, merit, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure review purposes.
 - C. Interdisciplinary work, which may include both teaching and research, is a vital part of the activity of the modern university. The EMF PTR Committee will evaluate interdisciplinary work as having equal "weight" with work done entirely within EMF.
 - D. The Department gives additional "weight" to peer-reviewed/juried publications, screenings, festivals, etc. It is the faculty member's responsibility to note the nature of how the work has been peer-reviewed.
 - E. Faculty are expected to expand the knowledge base in their respective fields by items under either 1 or 2 below, or by a combination of 1 and 2.

1. Conducting research and generating new knowledge and creative products. This roughly correlates with Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Application.

The standards and expectations for **reappointment**:

- a. A clearly defined scholarship/creative agenda and focus
- b. Expertise in methodologies appropriate to one's scholarship and/or creative agenda
- c. Strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at the time of the tenure decision

The standards for **promotion to Assistant Professor**:

- a. The standards for reappointment
- b. Award of terminal degree

The standards for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:

- a. Standards a-b under "reappointment"
- b. Efforts to obtain funding to support one's scholarship or creative goals
- c. Evidence that one's research agenda or scholarly achievement has matured over time
- d. Dissemination of one's scholarship and creative work to appropriate publics
- e. Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship or artistic expression

The standards for **promotion to Professor**:

The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- a. A sustained record of conducting and reporting research in one's field or a sustained effort in a particular medium or style
- b. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field or unique artistic expression
- c. Distinction in the quality of one's scholarship or creative activity

2. Synthesizing and integrating knowledge. This roughly correlates with Scholarship of Integration and Scholarship of Teaching.

The standards for **reappointment**:

- a. Currency in the knowledge base that encompasses one's field of inquiry

- b. Application of that knowledge base to one's teaching, service, and other professional activities
- c. Strong evidence of potential for meeting the standards for tenure at the time of that decision

The standards for **promotion to Assistant Professor:**

- a. The standards for reappointment
- b. Award of terminal degree

The standards for tenure and **promotion to Associate Professor:**

- a. Standards a-b under "reappointment"
- b. Efforts to obtain funding to support one's scholarship or creative and pedagogical goals
- c. Continued interaction with others internally and externally who share one's knowledge base
- d. Reviews of the knowledge base in one's field (via articles, conference papers, or other forums), identification of critical themes, and recommendations for extending that knowledge base

The standards for **promotion to Professor:**

The above standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

- a. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to integrate knowledge in their field
- b. Generation of new theories and models based on the knowledge base in one's field

- F. Faculty reviews of all types should give due attention to evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and to evidence of the faculty member's continuing professional development.

Although some faculty may emphasize teaching or service more heavily in their workload assignments, all faculty are responsible for continuing to develop disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and for providing evidence of professional growth in their annual reviews or review portfolios.

Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading, museum-going, attendance at performances, research in preparation of new courses, or other documented activities, subject to the judgment of the department and college committees, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, although they may not substitute for the evidence of a sustained pattern of completed work required for tenure or promotion.

VIII. Departmental Standards and Expectations for Service

The evaluation of service for faculty members shall rely on evidence of service contributions consistent with the faculty member's workload agreements. 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. Although diverse profiles of service contributions are anticipated among candidates, it is expected that, over time, all candidates will demonstrate service in the three domains identified below: to the university, to the profession, and to the community. Outstanding contributions at one level can balance more routine service at another level.

A. Service to the university

The standards for **reappointment** as instructor or Assistant Professor:

1. Involvement in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, College, and/or University levels.
2. Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise.

The standards for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:

1. Sustained participation in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, College, University and/or System levels.
2. Sustained contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise.
3. Advocacy in addressing important institutional issues
4. Recognition by the department, college, or university of the quality and impact of one's service

The standards for **promotion to Professor**:

1. The standards for tenure and promotion
2. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues
3. Distinction in the quality of one's service to the institution at program, department, College, University, and/or System levels

B. Service to the profession

Professional service includes activities in professional organizations or participating in other venues external to the university (local, regional, national or global) in which one's expertise is applied and which advance the university's mission.

Standard for **reappointment** as instructor or Assistant Professor:
Involvement with practitioners and/or with professional organizations

Standard for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:
Sustained involvement with practitioners and/or professional organizations

Standard for **promotion to Professor**:

1. The standards for tenure and promotion
2. Leadership in addressing issues in one's field
3. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance

C. Service to the community

Standard for **reappointment**:

Involvement in and/or engagement of the larger community (local, regional, national, or global) outside the university in ways that may or may not be directly related to one's academic expertise, but in ways which advance the department's, college's, or university's mission

Standard for **tenure and promotion to Associate Professor**:

Sustained involvement in and/or engagement of the larger community in ways which advance the department's, college's, or university's mission

Standards for **promotion to Professor**:

1. The standards for tenure and promotion
2. Leadership in collaboratively addressing issues important to the community
3. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance

IX. Procedures for **Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review** of Tenured Faculty

- 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. Evaluation portfolio materials required for the Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review are listed in Section I, B, 3, d of the ART policy.
- C. Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review decisions are separate from individual year Merit decisions.

- D. A faculty member can request a review for promotion to full professor in their 9th year of full-time faculty employment. If a faculty member is requesting a review for promotion to full professor at the same time as completing a five-year comprehensive review, the faculty member only needs to submit one portfolio for both reviews. When a faculty member's review for promotion to Full Professor occurs in the same year as a comprehensive five-year review, the five-year review shall be waived upon a successful promotion vote, and the 5-year review "clock" shall re-set. Upon a negative promotion vote, the PTR committee(s) shall complete a five-year review using the same portfolio materials provided for promotion review.

X. Procedures for **Third-Year Review** of Untenured Faculty

- A. At the conclusion of the fall semester during a candidate's third year at Towson University, the EMF PTR Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track candidates. The intent of the evaluation is 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. The EMF PTR 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 dean; however, it will not be forwarded to either the college PTR Committee or the provost.
- B. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the EMF PTR Committee as outlined in Section I.B. 3. c. of the ART policy.
- C. The EMF PTR 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:
 - 1. must include an indication of whether or not the faculty member's work to date is leading towards a positive tenure and promotion decision; and
 - 2. must provide guidance for the improvement of the evaluation portfolio in the event of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating.
- D. The following three-level scale is to serve as a general guideline for the review:
 - 1. **Superior progress.** Requirements include excellence in teaching/advising, excellence in scholarship, and meeting department standards in service.

2. **Satisfactory progress.** Requirements include progress towards excellence in teaching and scholarly productivity with satisfactory service as determined by the department. This ranking indicates that the department has determined that progress towards tenure is satisfactory, but improvements are needed.
 3. **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 tenure decision.
- E. Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the EMF chair and the EMF PTR Committee chair in accordance with the dates described in the PTR calendar. The written report will be shared with the dean.

XI. Procedures for Adding Information

If the faculty member or the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to their 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 by the date described in the PTR Calendar.

If the chairperson or program director participating in the evaluation process includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio other than their 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. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

**Calendar of EMF Department and Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, And Comprehensive Review
(All Deadlines Are Final Deadlines)**

The first Friday in May

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

May 31st

- A. Full-time faculty submit their Annual Review portfolio, including Annual Workload Plan (AR 2 form) and Annual Report (AR 1 form) for the year under review to the department chair.
- B. Chairs submit their Chairs Annual Workload Plan and Chairs Annual Report for the year under review to their dean.
- C. If May 31st falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline shall be the first business day after May 31st.
- D. Faculty/chairpersons on sabbatical, FMLA, or other leave during the year under review will only be rated on categories relevant to their duties as agreed upon in their Annual Workload Plan (AR 2 form) for the year under review.

The Third Friday in June

- A. Evaluation portfolios for Promotion to Associate or Full Professor and for Five-Year Comprehensive Review are due
- 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.
- C. All faculty members with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by chair and dean of the written professional development plan.
- D. Eligible Lecturers wishing to be considered for promotion submit materials to the chairperson

First Workday in July

- a. For faculty – chair sends the dean, and copies the faculty member, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons
- b. For chairpersons – dean sends the provost, and copies the chairperson, the completed Merit Evaluation Form for Fulltime Faculty and/or Chairpersons to the chairperson
- c. Any negative decision must be accompanied by a written rationale in the comments section of the evaluation form or as an attachment.
- d. Faculty/chairpersons may appeal a decision of no merit.

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 the faculty member's appointment ends after the third or subsequent academic year. To meet this deadline, a modified schedule may be required as provided in Section III.D.4.a.

August 15

Final date for faculty to add information to update their evaluation portfolio for promotion with materials that became available after June 1st unless the schedule for review is modified pursuant to Section III.D.4.a.

The First Friday in September

Department chair approval of the list of additional faculty to be considered for inclusion in the department tenure and/or promotion committee

The Second Friday in September

- A. University PTRM Committee shall meet and elect a chair and notify the Senate Executive Committee's Member-at-large of the committee members and chairperson for the academic year.
- B. Should faculty decide to appeal the chairperson's merit decision, the faculty member will provide a written rebuttal of the chairperson's decision to the department PTR Committee, along with the chairperson's rationale, copying the chairperson.
- C. Should the chairperson decide to appeal the dean's merit decision, the chairperson will provide a written rebuttal to the dean's decision to the provost, copying the dean.

The Third Friday in September

- A. Faculty notify department chair of intention to submit materials for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- B. College PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTR Committee (if necessary).
- C. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in September

- A. Department chairperson notifies department faculty, dean, and Provost of any department faculty member's intention to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in the next academic year.
- B. For faculty merit appeals, the department PTR Committee will render a written decision to the dean, copying the faculty member and the chairperson.

The Second Friday in October

- A. Department PTR Committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
- B. College PTR documents are due to the university PTRM Committee if changes have been made.
- C. For faculty merit appeals, in the event of a negative decision by the department PTR, the dean will review the materials submitted by the PTR Committee, faculty member, and chairperson and notify the faculty member and chairperson of their decision.

The Fourth Friday in October

- A. Department chairperson's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment in the first through fifth years, promotion, tenure, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure review is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and conveyed to the faculty member.
- B. The department chairperson will place their independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- C. The department PTR Committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.
- D. For faculty and chairperson merit appeals, in the event of a negative decision by the dean, the provost will review the materials submitted by the dean, department PTR Committee, faculty member, and chairperson. The faculty member, dean, and chairperson will be notified of the provost's decision.

The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the department PTR Committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTR chairperson to the dean's office.

November 30th

- A. All documentation (recommendations of the committee and department chair, any rebuttals, any statements or information in an "Information Added section", etc.) to be used as part of the consideration process must be included in the evaluation portfolio.
- B. The dean must notify the provost in writing of reappointment/non-reappointment recommendation(s) for tenure-track faculty in their second or subsequent academic year of service. Negative recommendations shall be delivered in person by the dean or sent confidentially through the File Delivery Service to the faculty member's home.

The First Friday in December

Any changes to Department PTR documents are delivered to the college PTR Committee.

The Second Friday in December

First-year tenure-track faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for the Fall semester to the department chairperson.

December 15th (USM mandated date)

Tenure-track faculty in the second academic year of service must be notified by the President in writing of non-reappointment for the next academic year.

The First Friday in January

- A. The department PTR Committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
- B. The college PTR Committee reports with vote counts and recommendations for faculty reviewed for tenure and/or promotion are submitted to the dean.

The Third Friday in January

- A. The dean's written evaluation regarding promotion and/or tenure with recommendation is added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- B. The college PTR Committee's report with vote counts and recommendations and the dean's recommendation are conveyed in writing to the faculty member.
- C. The department PTR Committee and chairperson recommendations concerning reappointment for first-year tenure-track faculty are delivered to the faculty member and the dean.
- D. All documentation for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department chairperson.
- E. Department chair recommendations on reappointment of first-year faculty must be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.

The First Friday in February

- A. The college dean forwards the summative portfolio inclusive of the committee's and the dean's recommendations of each faculty member with a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure or five-year comprehensive post-tenure review to the provost.
- B. The dean forwards all recommendations regarding reappointment/non-reappointment to the provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall prepare their own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

- A. Any changes to department PTR documents (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM Committee.
- B. Negative reappointment recommendations for first-year faculty are forwarded from the Provost to the President.

March 1

First year faculty must be notified of non-reappointment by written notification from the university president.

First Friday in March

Faculty under third-year review must be provided with written and face-to-face feedback on their performance toward tenure.

Third Friday in March

Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department, and college PTR Committee chairpersons, department chairperson, and dean of the college.

APPENDIX A: EMF POLICIES ON TEACHING EVALUATIONS

Teaching is the central purpose of Towson University and therefore all faculty recommended for promotion, tenure, and merit should be high quality teachers. 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. Teaching effectiveness can best be evaluated through multiple criteria, including but not limited to:

1. Quantitative student evaluations
 2. Summaries of written evaluations from student evaluation forms
 3. Copies of signed reports from peer observations of teaching
 4. Comments on teaching from department and chair letters evaluating the candidate
 5. The candidate's reflective essay on their teaching (self-evaluation)
 6. Evaluation of student learning outcomes
 7. Evidence of development of new courses, and/or new programs
 8. Evidence of the use of appropriate technologies to improve instruction
 9. Evidence of the use of contemporary theory and practice to improve instruction
 10. Professional awards for teaching excellence
 11. Grade distribution reports, including departmental averages
1. Student Evaluation Process
 1. Student evaluations are required for all courses taught, excluding internships and independent studies.
 2. A shared course evaluation instrument has been developed and is being used by various academic departments, including EMF. Using the Campus Labs course evaluation tool, students complete a single course evaluation instrument online for each course in which they are enrolled. A "window" for completing the evaluation of

a specific course will occur during the last two weeks of each term and session. The end dates associated with the sessions are used to determine the “window” of completion, the grade hold period, and the release date of the results.

3. EMF faculty members may develop additional questions to supplement the Campus Labs instrument and/or develop a secondary evaluation instrument specific to their courses according to University Assessment requirements.
 - a. Student evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner to assure the confidentiality of the student.

2. Peer Evaluation Policy

1. Classroom visits are required when the person is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the 5-year comprehensive post-tenure review.
2. Every new faculty member (adjunct, lecturer, or tenure-track) must be evaluated in their first semester. This evaluation is to be considered a mentoring evaluation, where consultation with the evaluator is required.
3. For untenured faculty members, a minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per academic year, until after their third-year review. After the third-year review, there shall be one (1) evaluation per year, unless the PTR Committee deems otherwise.
4. A minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted within two years of a faculty member self-nominating for promotion to Professor. A minimum of two (2) peer observation shall be conducted during the Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review period.
5. The department PTR chair will choose the peers selected for the reviews.
6. Advance notice of at least one (1) week of the peer observation shall be given to the faculty member.
7. Criteria for peer evaluations include, but are not limited to, class format, class objectives, class organization and management, clarity of syllabus, creative pedagogy, and effective presentation of appropriate course content.
8. After the faculty member receives the completed evaluation, a conference must be scheduled, unless it is waived by the person being evaluated.

9. The written evaluation can be modified after the conference, if both faculty members involved agree.
 10. The faculty member being evaluated can append a response to the evaluation.
 11. The faculty member being evaluated can also request an additional evaluation (from a different evaluator).
 12. Three signed copies of the evaluation must be made: one for the person being evaluated (this will eventually go to their PTR file); one for the Department chair (this will eventually go to the Department Personnel File); one for the Department PTR chair (this is to show that the evaluation was completed).
3. Self-Evaluation Policy
1. A faculty member being evaluated for tenure, promotion, Third Year Review, or Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review must include a reflective essay on their teaching. A reflective essay on teaching is encouraged at other times.
 2. Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching philosophy, and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations. When appropriate, the self-evaluation may also address items 6-11 listed at the beginning of Appendix A.

FACULTY CLASSROOM EVALUATION FORM

Instructor:

Course No. /Sec.:

Date of Evaluation:

Evaluator:

(Please use additional pages if needed.)

CLASS FORMAT—CLASS OBJECTIVES:

ORGANIZATION—CLASS MANAGEMENT:

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS—CLASS ENVIRONMENT:

ENGAGEMENT OF STUDENTS:

CLARITY OF PRESENTATION:

SYLLABUS:

SUGGESTIONS:

Signature of Evaluator Date

Signature of Adjunct Faculty Member Evaluated Date

A faculty member's signature does not necessarily constitute an agreement with the contents of this evaluation.

I waive consultation with the evaluator. Date