

Department of Mass Communication

Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

Approved by MCOM Department, September 8, 2023; Vote 19-0

I. General Principles	2
II. Committee Structure	3
III. Method of Selection	4
IV. Policies and Procedures	5
V. Evaluation Procedures.....	6
VI. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Teaching and Advising	9
VII. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Scholarship	10
VIII. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Service	13
IX. Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty	15
X. Procedures for Third-Year Review of Untenured Faculty	15
APPENDIX A: MCOM PTR5 Calendar	17
APPENDIX B: MCOM POLICIES ON TEACHING EVALUATIONS.....	20
Student Evaluation Process	20
Peer Evaluation Policy	20

Department of Mass Communication
Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

I. General Principles

- A. The following document describes the general criteria and procedures related to faculty appointment, rank, and tenure in the Department of Mass Communication (MCOM). The MCOM policies are consistent with those of the University System of Maryland (USM), Towson University, and the College of Fine Arts and Communication (COFAC). The procedures and expectations for review set forth in this document may be amended from time to time. The provisions of the USM policy supersede any conflicting provisions at the university, college, or department level.
 1. General information regarding the University System of Maryland policy on evaluation, promotion, tenure, and permanent status may be found in the Board of Regents—II-1.00 University System Policy on Appointment, Rank, and Tenure of Faculty (ART), <https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II100.pdf>.
 2. Towson University policy on appointment, rank, and tenure of faculty is found in the TU Policy 02-01.00 - Policy on Appointment, Rank and Tenure of Faculty, <https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/02-01-00-policy-appointment-rank-tenure-faculty.html>.
 3. COFAC policy on appointment, rank, and tenure of faculty is found at <https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/cofacaapproved.pdf>
- B. Standards: The Towson University policy on appointment, rank, and tenure and faculty workload and responsibilities provides the basis for standards and expectations common to all full-time faculty. The tenure and/or promotion decision is based on the needs of the university and the competence and quality of the individual. All faculty members 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.
- C. University standards for all tenured/tenure-track 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 PTR5 calendar.

D. College

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

E. Department

1. A faculty member is responsible for meeting the standards and expectations of the Department of Mass Communication, as outlined below.

II. Committee Structure

A. The MCOM PTR5 Committee is comprised of the following:

1. The Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure/Third-Year Review and Five-Year Comprehensive Review Committees will hereafter be referred to as the MCOM PTR5 Committee.
2. The MCOM PTR5 Committee: All tenured faculty within the department with at least one year of full-time service.
3. The MCOM PTR5 Committee has two rank committees: The Assistant Rank Committee, and Full/Associate Rank Committee. The Assistant and Full/Associate Rank Committees should be comprised of all full-time faculty above the rank of the individual being considered, with the

exception of full professors who will be evaluated by other full professors excluding the individual being considered.

- B. The MCOM Lecturer Review Committee is comprised of the following:
 - 1. The Lecturer Review Committee should be composed of four members, including the two unit coordinators and up to two Assistant Professors who will be selected according to a rotation plan established by the MCOM PTR5 Committee in consultation with department chair. Lecturers II, III, associate professors, or full professors who wish to serve on the Lecturer Review Committee may seek appointment and serve in place of an Assistant Professor.
 - 2. The Lecturer Review Committee shall review and evaluate all Lecturers' portfolios in the areas of teaching, professional development, and service, making recommendations for reappointment and promotion to the department chair in a manner consistent with procedures to evaluate tenure and tenure-track faculty performance.
- C. A quorum for the MCOM PTR5 and Lecturer Review Committees shall be 50% or more of the eligible members. However, in all cases, at least three committee members must be present.
- D. The department chair shall not be a voting member of the MCOM PTR5 and Lecturer Review Committees. Non-voting status shall be indicated in the deliberation letters.

III. Method of Selection

- A. MCOM PTR5 Committee
 - 1. The chair of the PTR5 committee shall serve a two-year renewable term. The chair shall be elected by majority vote of MCOM PTR5 members by the fourth Friday in April and shall assume responsibility starting in August of that year. This person shall have general oversight over the process of faculty evaluation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure in coordination with the department chair. Specifically, the PTR5 chair shall be responsible for convening, chairing, and reporting the results of all PTR5 committee meetings; creating a schedule and collecting the results of all peer evaluations within MCOM; coordinating the revision of the MCOM PTR5 documents; and being available for advising full-time faculty about the reappointment, promotion, tenure, third-year review, and five-year comprehensive review processes. If needed, an alternate will be voted on by the PTR5 committee.
 - 2. The PTR5 committee must have at least three members. If less than three faculty members are available within the department, an additional faculty member or members shall be chosen following the process outlined in the university ART document.

3. The PTR5 chair and the department chair are responsible for filling out the Department Summary Recommendation Form.
4. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave are welcome to serve on the PTR5 committee, providing they can attend all meetings.

B. Lecturer Review Committee

1. The chair role is rotated between the two unit coordinators every two years.

IV. Policies and Procedures

- A. The responsibility for presenting materials for the annual review, reappointment, promotion, tenure, third-year review, or five-year comprehensive review rests with the faculty member being evaluated.
- B. Guided by the PTR5 chair and department, college, and university criteria, faculty members shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Lecturers shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between teaching, professional development, and service. These distinctions should be made clear in narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
- C. All faculty, tenured, tenure-track, and lecturers shall submit their evaluation portfolios to the PTR5 chair by the third Friday in June. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized in consultation with the PTR5 chair, who will be guided by the directions of the provost. The type of review determines portfolio material and process. PTR5 committee members should maintain confidentiality and shall not share any submitted portfolios outside of the committee.
- D. Required materials for Promotion, Tenure and other reviews are listed in the university ART document, as well as the organization of such materials. Annual review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 1. Completed and signed AR (Annual Report), AWP (Annual Workload Plan), or CAR (Chairperson's Annual R) forms
 2. Current curriculum vitae
 3. Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review
 4. Evaluation, as appropriate, of teaching and advising (student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught)
 5. Documentation of scholarship and service.
 6. Narrative statement describing how expectations were met (and integrated) for teaching, advising, research or professional development, and service based on the workload agreement for the period under review.
- E. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty must add the following items to those listed in section D:
 1. Peer and/or department chairperson's evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator.

- F. Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review must include the following documents:
 - 1. All of the items listed in section D
 - 2. Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two years and the fall semester of the current year
 - 3. Student and peer/chair evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two years and the fall semester of the current year.

- G. Portfolio materials for full review of faculty for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents:
 - 1. All materials listed above from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.

- H. Evaluation portfolio materials for five-year comprehensive review of all tenured faculty must include the following documents:
 - 1. All materials listed above in section D for all five years
 - 2. Two peer evaluations of teaching conducted at least three semesters apart.
 - 3. Reflective comprehensive summary written by the faculty member being evaluated, analyzing the preceding five years of their work and planning for the upcoming five years in the areas of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.

- I. If the faculty member being evaluated or the PTR5 or MCOM chair participating in the evaluation process wishes to rebut or clarify information or statements in the evaluation portfolio, the faculty member can add a statement to the 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.

- J. If the PTR5 or MCOM chair includes information other than the faculty member's own materials in the evaluation portfolio, that specific information shall immediately be communicated to the faculty member being evaluated before any further evaluation takes place. A failure to notify the faculty member within five business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation portfolio.

V. Evaluation Procedures

- A. Committee deliberations are considered confidential. The faculty member being evaluated shall be informed in writing of committee decisions by the fourth Friday in October.

- B. The MCOM chair may prepare an independent recommendation on reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. The MCOM chair's recommendation letter will be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio after MCOM PTR5 deliberation.

- C. Negative decisions shall be delivered in person by the MCOM chair (or designee) or sent by the File Delivery System (FDS) or certified mail to the candidate's home by the fourth Friday in October.
- D. All votes regarding reappointment, tenure, promotion, or five-year comprehensive review shall be by secret electronic ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by either the MCOM PTR5 Committee chair or the Lecturer Review Committee chair. The PTR5 chair shall forward a signed, dated electronic report of the results of the votes and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio but shall be forwarded to the provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion files until three 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 on good cause, including an impermissible conflict of interest.
- E.
- F. Tie votes: In cases where reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are being considered, a majority vote is necessary for a decision to be made. However, if there is a tie in the voting process, the outcome is considered a vote of no.
- G. The faculty member being evaluated may add a written response to any document in the evaluation portfolio.
- H. Negative recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion, tenure, or five-year comprehensive review shall be delivered in writing, in person, and sent via the secure FDS email system by the dates indicated in the PTR5 calendar. Reviewers are also responsible for placing their recommendation in the candidate's portfolio. There are three (3) types of appeals/rebuttals.
 1. To contest perceived errors in judgment by the department and/or college PTR5 committees, the department chairperson, the dean, and/or the provost regarding performance evaluation, the candidate may submit a written rebuttal. The rebuttal letter must include clarifying documentation and be submitted within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the negative recommendation.
 2. Procedural appeals relate to alleged errors in the procedures followed during the review, recommendation, and notification process. Procedural appeals shall be made to the University PTRM committee and be in writing, clearly stating the alleged procedural errors, accompanied by supporting documents. Appeals should be delivered to the respective dean, provost, or UPTRM chair within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the notification of the negative recommendation.
 3. Appeals alleging unlawful discrimination shall follow the procedures outlined in the university policy 06-01.00 "Policy Prohibiting Discrimination."

For a full description of the appeal/rebuttal process, refer to the university ART policy, Appendix 3, Section V:
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/02-01-00-policy-appointment-rank-tenure-faculty.html>.

- I. MCOM PTR5 document pertaining to standards and criteria of evaluation shall be developed by the PTR5 committee.
 1. The MCOM PTR5 document must be distributed to all tenure-track and tenured faculty as well as lecturers in the department for input at least 10 business days prior to the committee vote on the document.
 2. Final approval at the department level shall be by a simple majority vote of tenure-track, tenured, and lecturer faculty members, excepting faculty who are on leave from the university (e.g., medical, sabbatical, etc.). Signatures shall be used to signify that each faculty member voted on the department PTR5 document.
 3. Prior to submission to the university PTRM committee, the department document, with Approval Form, shall 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 PTR5 document shall be delivered by the dean to the university PTRM committee by the second Friday in February.
 5. The MCOM PTR5 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 MCOM PTR5 chair is responsible for assuring that the approved departmental PTR5 document is posted on the Towson University website.
 7. The department shall review its PTR5 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 level shall remain in effect until changed according to the procedures described herein. Faculty members shall be evaluated for tenure pursuant to the departmental PTR5 standards and criteria in effect during the year they are first appointed to a tenure-track position.
- J. Evaluation procedures for first-year tenure-track and lecturer reappointment: the department chair shall review all required documentation for first-year faculty, including SENTF, CV, course syllabi, student and peer evaluations, and grade distribution report; meet with the candidate to discuss the review; and make a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment to the department PTR5 committee. Should the chair's recommendation be for non-reappointment, the department PTR5 committee will convene to review the relevant documentation and vote in accordance with standard PTR5 procedure.
- K. Faculty members will undergo a separate process for merit evaluation that is

distinct from reappointment, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and five-year comprehensive review. For more information, refer to <https://www.towson.edu/provost/academicresources/meritpolicy.pdf>.

VI. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Teaching and Advising

A. Teaching – may take a variety of forms, ranging from the use of technology to the development of new courses and programs, including those involving collaborative or interdisciplinary work and civic engagement, as well as faculty exchanges, teaching abroad, off-site learning, and supervision of undergraduate and graduate research and thesis preparation. It may also encompass an emphasis on pedagogy, fulfilling the various learning outcomes defined in a specific curriculum and other aspects of learning and its assessment. In addition, it may include advising responsibilities. See Appendix for specific details on teaching evaluations.

1. Standards for *Reappointment*:
 - a. Being knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field
 - b. Ongoing refinement and improvement of courses taught
 - 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. Carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi
 - e. Availability to students
 - f. Clear potential for meeting tenure standards by the time of the tenure decision.
2. Standards for promotion to *Assistant Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the standards for *Reappointment*
 - b. Advising (see VI B below)
3. Standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the standards a-e listed under *Reappointment*
 - b. Demonstrating 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) Course content and teaching processes aligned with the department's mission
 - 4) Sensitivity and responsiveness to cultural and individual differences in the classroom
 - 5) Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation
 - 6) Effective instruction as measured by student evaluation
 - 7) Recognition by 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. Meeting 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.

B. Advising – is an important faculty responsibility.

Standards for all full-time faculty (excluding first-year full-time faculty):

1. Being accessible to students for advising sessions;
2. Scheduling formal advising hours each semester; and
3. Maintaining familiarity with program requirements and current academic policies.

C. Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is the central purpose of Towson University and, therefore, all faculty being considered for reappointment, promotion, and tenure should be high-quality teachers. The evaluation of teaching should take into account classroom performance, as well as other venues for teaching, the varied forms in which faculty invest in preparation for teaching, and the role of faculty in both formal and informal advising.

Teaching effectiveness can be evaluated through multiple criteria (in no specific order), including but not limited to:

1. quantitative student evaluations
2. summaries of written feedback from student evaluations
3. copies of signed reports from peer observations of teaching
4. comments on teaching from departmental and chair letters evaluating the faculty member
5. the faculty member's reflective essay on their teaching (self-evaluation)
6. evaluation of student learning outcomes
7. evidence of development of new courses and/or 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 or recognition for teaching excellence
11. grade distribution reports, including departmental averages.

See Appendix for specific details on teaching evaluations.

VII. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Scholarship

- A. Scholarship is widely interpreted and takes many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration and/or Teaching. Regardless of the type of scholarship, 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 evidenced by recognition from the relevant community of scholars.

- B. The MCOM PTR5 Committee considers peer review and dissemination as ways to validate the scholarship and/or creative activity of the faculty member being evaluated. In presenting scholarly/creative materials in the portfolio, the faculty member should explain the review process and dissemination plan, particularly if the publication form or site, or means of dissemination, is not commonly known or understood within the department.
- C. The committee distinguishes 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 recognition. However, some venues that are considered local can still be of the very highest quality—e.g., a performance at the Kennedy Center or a book published by Johns Hopkins University Press.
- D. 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 scholarships at Towson University.
 - 1. *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.
 - 2. *Scholarship of Discovery*: conducting traditional research for the sake of knowledge, including aspects of creative work in the visual and performing arts.
 - 3. *Scholarship of Integration*: applying knowledge in ways that overcome the isolation and fragmentation of the traditional disciplines.
 - 4. *Scholarship of Teaching*: exploring ideas, methods and technologies that improve teaching and learning and disseminating this work to relevant publics through articles, presentations, media productions, websites, etc.
- E. Appropriate kinds of scholarship. The following list of activities presents some of the more obvious forms (but not every possible form) in which scholarship/creative activity can be demonstrated:
 - 1. Publication: articles, books, chapters in books, reviews, and conference proceedings. Generally, competitive works are valued more than invited works.
 - 2. Academic preparation: conference participation (competitive or invited), degrees, courses, workshops, and technical/course pedagogy.
 - 3. Productions: multi-media/digital projects.
- F. On a department-wide basis, these forms of scholarship and creative activity are considered equally valid for reappointment, third-year review, tenure, promotion, five-year comprehensive, and post-tenure review purposes.

- G. Interdisciplinary work, which may include both teaching and research, is a vital part of the activity of the modern university. The MCOM PTR5 Committee will evaluate interdisciplinary work as having equal weight with work done entirely within MCOM.
- H. Criteria for Scholarship: Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Application - Conducting research and generating new knowledge and creative products. These are aligned with Scholarship of Discovery and Scholarship of Application.
1. The standards for *Reappointment*:
 - a. Having 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 review.
 2. The standards for promotion to *Assistant Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the standards for *Reappointment*
 - b. Award of terminal degree.
 3. The standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the 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 developed over time
 - d. Dissemination of one's scholarship or creative work to appropriate publics
 - e. Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship or artistic expression.
 4. The standards for promotion to *Professor*: The above standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor* 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
 - c. Distinction in the quality of one's scholarship or creative activity.
- I. Criteria for Scholarship: Scholarship of Integration and Scholarship of Teaching - Synthesizing and integrating knowledge. These are aligned with Scholarship of Integration and Scholarship of Teaching.
1. 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.

2. The standards for promotion to *Assistant Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the standards for *Reappointment*
 - b. Award of terminal degree.
 3. The standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the 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 both 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.
 4. The standards for promotion to *Professor*: the above standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor* plus these additional standards:
 - a. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty
 - b. Generation of new theories and models based on the knowledge base in one's field.
- J. Although some faculty may focus more on teaching or service in their workload assignments, all faculty are expected to continue developing disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise and provide evidence of professional growth in their annual reviews and/or review portfolios. Reports on scholarly reading, attending museums and performances, researching for new courses, or other documented activities may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews, subject to the judgment of the department and college committees. However, such activities may not substitute for the evidence of a sustained pattern of completed work required for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
- K. Lecturers shall include on the Annual Report what active steps have been taken during the year to maintain or enhance disciplinary and teaching currency in relation to the courses they teach, through a program of reading, investigation, training, or presentation.

VIII. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Service

- A. The evaluation of a faculty member's service shall be based on evidence of service contributions consistent with their workload agreements. Evaluation should consider the extent and quality of service, not the mere fact of committee membership or position held. The faculty member should provide sufficient information about 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, it is expected that, over time, the faculty member demonstrate service in the three domains identified below: to the university, to the profession,

and to the community. Outstanding contributions in one domain can balance more routine service in another. The evaluation of service will follow different standards at different levels.

B. Service to the university

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

- a. Involvement in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, college, and/or university levels
 - b. Contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise.
2. The standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*:
 - a. Sustained participation in the institution's faculty governance structure at program, department, college, university and/or system levels
 - b. Sustained contributions to the institution that are focused and draw upon one's professional expertise
 - c. Advocacy in addressing important institutional issues
 - d. Recognition by the department, college, or university of the quality and impact of one's service.
 3. The standards for Promotion to *Professor*: The above standards for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor* plus these additional standards:
 - a. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues
 - b. Distinction in the quality of one's service to the institution at program, department, college, university, and/or system levels.

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

1. Standard for *Reappointment* as instructor or *Assistant Professor*: Involvement with practitioners and/or with professional organizations.
2. Standard for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*: Sustained involvement with practitioners and/or professional organizations.
3. Standard for promotion to *Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the above standard for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*;
 - b. Leadership in addressing issues in one's field
 - c. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance.

D. Service to the community

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. Standards for promotion to *Professor*:
 - a. Meeting the standard for tenure and promotion to *Associate Professor*
 - b. Leadership in collaboratively addressing issues important to the community
 - c. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance.

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

- A. All tenured faculty shall be reviewed at least once every five years. Comprehensive reviews are summative for a period of the preceding five academic years.
- B. Evaluation portfolio materials required for the five-year comprehensive review are listed in 02-01.00, Appendix 3 of the TU ART Policy.

X. Procedures for Third-Year Review of Untenured Faculty

- A. The MCOM PTR5 Committee shall conduct a Third-Year Review of tenure-track faculty after the conclusion of the fall semester during their third year at Towson University. The intent of the review is to assess progress toward achieving tenure and to provide advice and mentoring. The committee will identify any issues or shortcomings in the profile of the faculty member being evaluated and offer assistance where needed. The committee will also acknowledge and commend satisfactory or exemplary progress. The evaluations from the MCOM PTR5 Committee will be included in the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the dean, but not forwarded to either the college PTR5 committee or the provost.
- B. The faculty member to be reviewed shall prepare an interim evaluation portfolio of activities for evaluation by the MCOM PTR5 committee as outlined in 02-01.00, Appendix 3 of the TU ART Policy.
- C. The MCOM PTR5 Committee will evaluate the faculty member's portfolio and provide a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, scholarly/creative activity, service, and other relevant criteria. This statement:
 1. Must indicate whether 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 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 required documentation is due to the MCOM chair by the third Friday of January.
 - F. The MCOM PTR5 Committee chair and MCOM chair will provide written feedback and conduct a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member by the first Friday of 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 MCOM department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and provide more extensive feedback to the faculty member.

APPENDIX A: MCOM PTR5 Calendar

The first Friday in May

The MCOM PTR5 Committee and COFAC PTR Committee are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed)

The Third Friday in June

- A. Faculty submit an evaluation portfolio to the MCOM PTR5 Committee chair.
- B. Faculty submit a list of at least three names of any additional faculty to be included on department tenure and/or promotion committee (if necessary) to the department chair and dean.
- C. Faculty with a negative comprehensive review must have final approval by the department 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 on 02-01.00, III. 4 of the TU ART Policy.

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 chair 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 PTR Committee approval of faculty to be added to a department's PTR5 committee (if necessary).
- C. 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 02-01.00, Appendix 3 of the TU ART Policy.
- D. First-year tenure-track faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson. First-year lecturers must finalize the Annual Workload Plan (AWP) with the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in September

The department chair notifies 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 PTR5 committee's reports with recommendations and vote count on all

faculty members are submitted to the department chair.

- B. College PTR documents are due to the university PTRM committee if changes have been made.

The Fourth Friday in October

- A. The department chair's written evaluation for faculty considered for reappointment, 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 chair will place his/her independent evaluation into the evaluation portfolio.
- C. The department PTR5 committee's report with recommendations and vote count and the department chair's evaluation are distributed to the faculty member.

The Second Friday in November

The faculty member's evaluation portfolio, inclusive of the department PTR5 committee's written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTR5 chair to the dean's office.

November 30

- 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 PTR5 documents are delivered to the college PTR committee if any changes have been made.

December 15 (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

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. First-year faculty submit an evaluation portfolio for reappointment to the department chair. All documentation for the third-year review of tenure-track faculty is submitted by the faculty member to the department PTR5 chair.

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.
- C. The department chair, after reviewing documentation and meeting with first-year faculty members, makes a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment. If reappointment, department chair notifies faculty member, department PTR5 committee, dean, and provost. If non-reappointment, the department chair notifies the faculty member, dean, and department PTR5 committee and forwards all relevant documentation to the department PTR5 committee and to the dean.

The Second Friday in February

Department documents concerning promotion, tenure, reappointment, third-year review, and five-year comprehensive review (with an approval form signed by all current faculty members) are submitted to the university PTRM committee.

The Third Friday in February

Department PTR5 committee makes recommendation for the first-year faculty who were not recommended for reappointment by the department chair.

March 1

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

The Provost's letter of decision is conveyed to the faculty member, department and college PTR committee chair, department chair, and dean of the college.

APPENDIX B: MCOM POLICIES ON TEACHING EVALUATIONS

Teaching is the central purpose of Towson University and, therefore, all faculty recommended for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure 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 (in no specific order), 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 departmental and chair letters evaluating the candidate
5. the reflective essay by the faculty member 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.

Student Evaluation Process

Student evaluations are required for all courses taught, excluding internships and independent studies. Using the university course evaluation tool, students complete a single course evaluation instrument for each course in which they are enrolled. A window for completing the evaluation of a specific course will occur during the end of each term and session.

Faculty may develop additional questions to supplement the instrument and/or develop a secondary evaluation instrument specific to their courses according to university assessment requirements. Student evaluations shall be conducted in a manner to assure the confidentiality of the student.

Peer Evaluation Policy

1. Classroom visits are required when the faculty member is being considered for reappointment, third-year review, promotion, or tenure. Peer reviews of teaching are also required for the five-year comprehensive post-tenure review.
2. For tenure-track faculty members, a minimum of two peer observations are assigned per academic year, except during their first year when two evaluations per semester are required.
3. Tenured faculty members who apply **for promotion to the rank of Professor** must undergo a minimum of two peer observations during the academic year following their application.
4. During **the five-year comprehensive review** period, a minimum of two peer

observations must be conducted, with at least three semesters separating each observation.

5. The department PTR5 committee or its designees will approve the peers selected for the reviews.
6. The faculty member must be given at least one week's advance notice before a peer observation takes place.
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 faculty member being evaluated.
9. The written evaluation can be modified after the conference, if both parties 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. Two signed copies of the evaluation must be made: one for the faculty member being evaluated (this will eventually go to their PTR5 file); one for the department chair (this will eventually go to the department personnel file).