

Department of Electronic Media and Film

Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit

Revised 12/2018

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.	Merit Policy.....	Page10
VI.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Teaching & Advising.....	Page 12
VII.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Scholarship.....	Page 15
VIII.	Departmental Standards and Expectations for Service.....	Page 19
IX.	Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review.....	Page 21
X.	Procedures for Third-Year Review of Untenured Faculty.....	Page 22
XI.	Procedures for Adding Information.....	Page 23
XII.	PTRM Calendar.....	Page 24
XIII.	Appendix A (Policy on Teaching Evaluations).....	Page 28
XIV.	Appendix B (Peer Evaluation Form).....	Page 31

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

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 his/her 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 PTRM 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. Merit, Third-Year Review, and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committee: same as Tenure/Reappointment Committee.
- C. The Tenure/Reappointment, Rank, and Merit, Third-Year Review and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review Committees will hereafter be referred to as the EMF PTRM Committee.
- D. A quorum for the PTRM 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 PTRM committee.

III. **Method of Selection**

- A. The Chair of the PTRM 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, and Merit, in coordination with the Department Chair. Specifically, the PTRM Chair shall be responsible for convening, chairing, and reporting the results of all PTRM Committee meetings; creating a schedule and collecting the results of all peer evaluations within EMF; coordinating the revision of EMF PTRM 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 PTRM 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 PTRM 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 on the PTRM 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 chair by the third Friday in June. Evaluation portfolios will be made available to committee members during normal working hours. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder (or submitted as an electronic portfolio). Binders should not be taken from the TU campus, nor should individual faculty members borrow them overnight.

B. Materials needed for faculty review process:

1. 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;
- c. Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
- d. Evaluation, as appropriate, of teaching and advising, including a complete printout of student evaluations for every course taught in the previous academic year (fall, spring, mini, summer) plus a summary of the evaluation results.
- e. Grade distribution results for all courses taught.
- f. Documentation of scholarship and service. More information is available in Section I.B. of the ART document.
- g. A narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how he/she has met (and integrated) teaching, advising, research, and service expectations based on his/her workload agreement for the period under review.

2. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty must add the following items for annual review to those listed in B.1:

- a. Peer and/or chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

3. Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:

- a. All of the items listed in B.1
- b. Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;

c. Student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year

4. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents: all materials listed above in B.1 and B.2 from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.

5. Evaluation portfolio materials for five-year comprehensive post-tenure review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:

- a. All materials listed above in B.1 for all five (5) years;
- b. Peer evaluations of teaching at least for the prior academic year; and
- c. A reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five (5) years of his/her work in the areas of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.

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 plays a central role in Merit decisions and is an important factor in reappointment, tenure, promotion, third-year review, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure review.

D. Methods of evaluation:

The evaluation will be based primarily upon the faculty member's documentation of his or her professional activities by way of the faculty evaluation portfolio. However, the methods by which EMF PTRM Committees evaluate their colleagues' professional contributions should not be too rigidly defined. Their perception of an individual's teaching, scholarship, and service is usually based upon formal as well as informal associations and settings over a period of time.

E. Decisions

Faculty members being evaluated shall be informed in writing of committee decisions no later than the ***fourth Friday in October***.

First year faculty should be informed in writing of the committee's decisions by the third Friday in January.

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 merit and/or 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) or sent by certified mail to the candidate's home by the fourth Friday in October.

H. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, 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 kept in 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, a tie vote shall result in recommendation of the higher level of merit.

J. A faculty member may add a written response to any document in his or her file.

K. Appeals

There are three kinds of appeals in the PTRM process: substantive, procedural, and appeals alleging discrimination. For a full discussion of appeals, see the ART document.

1. Appeals of substantive matters for Department decisions on Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, Merit and Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review should go to the COFAC

Dean's office for the COFAC PTRM Committee and be copied to the department chair and the department's PTRM chair. Appeals must be in writing, clearly stating the grounds for appeal, and must be accompanied by supporting documents.

Appeals must be delivered by certified mail or in person to the college Dean within twenty-one (21) calendar days of notification of the negative recommendation.

2. 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 by certified mail 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 PTRM chair, the dean, and the university PTRM committee chair.

3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination in race, color, religion, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and disability shall follow the specific procedures described in Towson University policy 06-01.00 "Prohibiting Discrimination on the basis of Race, Color, Religion, Age, National Origin, Sex and Disability."

L. EMF PTRM documents pertaining to standards, criteria, and/or expectations of evaluation shall be developed by the PTRM committee.

1. The EMF PTRM 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 PTRM 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 s/he has voted on the department PTRM documents.

3. Prior to submission to the university PTRM committee, the department document, with Approval Form, should be submitted to the college PTRM

committee and the dean of the college for approval by the first Friday in December.

4. Following approval by the college PTRM committee and the dean, the department PTRM document should be delivered by the dean to the chairperson of the university PTRM committee by the second Friday in February.

5. The department PTRM 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 PTRM 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 PTRM documents are posted on the Towson University website.

7. The department shall review its PTRM 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 PTRM 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. **Merit Policy**

In conjunction with guidelines issued by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the “Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty” or section AR II of the Annual Report form or section CAR II of the Chairperson’s Annual Report form shall serve as the basis for merit evaluation. All faculty will be evaluated each year at the department level for merit. Because promotion and tenure decisions are based on long-term contributions, annual merit decisions do not necessarily indicate progress toward

tenure or promotion. To qualify for merit, faculty members shall demonstrate achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service consistent with their AR Part II or CAR Part II.

- A. The University currently specifies a three category merit policy: Not Meritorious, Satisfactory (Base Merit), and Excellent (Base Merit + 1 Performance Merit).

- B. Basic criteria for Merit are as follows:
 - 2. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet the standards and expectations of the Department, College, and University.

 - 3. Satisfactory: Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department. Evidence of effective teaching. Satisfactory in Scholarship/Creative Activity and Service.

 - 4. Excellent: Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories. Teaching is the most important category, but a balanced profile is expected.

A rating of satisfactory shall mean at minimum that: (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in I.B of this document; (b) the faculty member has demonstrated effective teaching as evidenced in the annual review as described above; (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of ongoing scholarly/creative/professional work through the annual report, whether that work has been completed or is in progress; (d) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service.

A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of I.B of this document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. Evaluation of accomplishment meriting a rating of excellent shall be made in accordance with the proportion of a faculty member's time allocated to each area of responsibility in the annual workload assignment.

- C. 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 and/or PTRM Committee chair, appropriate percentages of teaching, scholarship, and service dependent upon activities determined annually.
- D. Relationships between Merit and Workload. There are three typical 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 80% 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 merit 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 merit evaluations will be based on this balanced profile.
 3. Faculty on a 3/3 load are scholars/teachers, with 60% 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 merit 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 his/her 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 PTRM Committee will develop written merit 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
 - i. Carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi
 - ii. Expertise and currency in the content of one's teaching
 - iii. Availability to students
 - iv. 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. Standards a-d listed under 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 listed 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, faculty recommended for Excellent Merit in 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 PTRM 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 his/her appointment, and currency in his/her academic field as affirmed by its community of scholars.

The EMF PTRM 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 PTRM 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**: The standards for tenure plus these additional standards:

1. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues
2. 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 standard 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 standard 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. However, consistency is likely, since the same PTRM Committee shall make these decisions.

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 PTRM 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 PTRM 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 PTRM committee or the Provost.

B. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the EMF PTRM committee as outlined in Section I.B. 3. c. of the ART policy.

C. The EMF PTRM 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. All documentation is due to the EMF chair by the third Friday in January.

F. Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the EMF chair and the EMF PTRM committee chair no later than the first Friday in March. The written report will be shared with the dean.

G. If a faculty member's mandatory tenure-review year is 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.

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 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.

If the chairperson or program director 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. A failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

EMF Department and Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure, And Comprehensive Review Calendar (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)

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 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 work that was completed before June 1 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

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.

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 PTRM Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTRM 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

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.

The Second Friday in October

- A. Department PTRM committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all faculty members are submitted to the department chairperson.
- B. College PTRM documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

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 his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- C. The department PTRM committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chairperson's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November

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

November 30th

- A. All documentation 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 by certified mail to the faculty member's home.

The First Friday in December

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

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 PTRM committee reports with recommendations and vote count on all first-year tenure-track faculty are submitted to the department chairperson.
- B. The college PTRM 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 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.
- 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 his/her own recommendation and send a copy to the faculty member and add this recommendation to the summative portfolio.

The Second Friday in February

- A. The dean will, following his/her review, forward department recommendations for faculty merit to the Provost. If the dean disagrees with the department recommendation, the dean shall add his/her recommendation to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio and deliver the negative decision in person or by certified mail to the faculty member's home.
- B. Department documents concerning promotion, tenure/reappointment, and merit (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM committee.
- C. 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 PTRM 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 his/her 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.

A. 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.

1. Student evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner to assure the confidentiality of the student.

B. 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 PTRM Committee deems otherwise.

4. A minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted within two years of a faculty member nominating him/her-self for promotion to Professor. A minimum of one (1) peer observation shall be conducted during the Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review period.

5. The department PTRM 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 his/her PTRM file); one for the Department Chair (this will eventually go to the Department Personnel File); one for the Department PTRM Chair (this is to show that the evaluation was completed).

C. 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 his/her 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