

Department Communication Studies

Policy on Faculty Evaluation for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment and Merit
(Approved by COMM department, Nov. 5, 2018; Vote 11-0 to approve)

UPTRM Approved Revisions May 2020

Table of Contents

I.	General Principles.....	Page 2
II.	Committee Structure and Method of Selection.....	Page 4
III.	Policies and Procedures.....	Page 6
IV.	Departmental Standards for Merit.....	Page 10
V.	Departmental Standards for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion	Page 15
	Standards for Teaching.....	Page 15
	Standards for Scholarship.....	Page 17
	Standards for Service.....	Page 19
VI.	Role of Tenured Faculty; Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review.....	Page 21
VII.	Procedures for Third-Year Review of Untenured Faculty.....	Page 22
VIII.	PTRM Calendar.....	Page 24
IX.	Reference Sources.....	Page 28
X.	Appendix A - Policy on Teaching Evaluations.....	Page 28
XI.	Appendix B – Peer Review Evaluation Policy and Forms.....	Page 28
XII.	Appendix C - Annual Merit Executive Summary Form.....	Page 34

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

I. General Principles

The following document describes the general criteria and procedures related to faculty appointment, rank and tenure in the Department of Communication Studies (COMM). The COMM policies are consistent with those of University System of Maryland (USM), Towson University (TU), and 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 University System of Maryland (USM) 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
<http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II100.pdf>
2. Towson University policy on appointment, rank, and tenure of faculty are found in the Appendix 3 to “02-01.00 - Towson University Policy on
<https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/documents/polices/02-01-00-towson-university-policy-on-appointment-rank-and-tenure-of-faculty-1.pdf>
3. COFAC policy on promotion, tenure, reappointment, and merit are found at
https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/senate/committees/documents/uptrm_committee_documents/uptrm_college_ptrm_policies/cofac_ptrm_04-21-2015.pdf

A. Standards: 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.

B. University standards for all University 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 role.
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. Communication Studies Department

1. This PTRM process reflects the department's commitment to supporting faculty success throughout the PTRM process. Faculty are expected to exhibit fairness and collegiality during deliberations reflective of a core commitment to a process that is supportive of faculty rather than punitive. First and foremost, COMM faculty should trust that the department PTRM process is created and executed in support of their career arc at all stages.
2. A faculty member is responsible for presenting evidence of meeting the standards and expectations of the Department of Communication Studies, as outlined below.
3. Adoption and subsequent changes to the COMM Department Merit and Tenure and Three-year Review documents will be by written ballot of the full department faculty. Faculty on leave (sabbatical, medical leave, etc.) may submit their vote by proxy by notification to both the Merit Chair and Co-Chair.
4. A 75% majority of the full department faculty must be reached for adoption and subsequent changes to department documents.

II. Committee Membership and Method of Selection. The COMM department will have two committees:

Reappointment and Merit Committee. The Reappointment, and Merit Committee *will hereafter be referred to as the Merit Committee.*

Tenure, Promotion, Third-year (pre-tenure) review, and Five year Post-Tenure review committee. The Tenure, Promotion, Third-year pre-tenure review, and Five Year Post-Tenure review committee *will hereafter be referred to as the Tenure committee.*

A. Reappointment and Merit Committee Structure

1. Membership of the Merit Committee consists of five members:
 - A. one Lecturer
 - B. one tenure-track faculty member
 - C. one tenured faculty member
 - D. one At-large member (from any rank)
 - E. COMM Department Chair who serves ex officio and does not vote. Non-voting status of the Department Chair will be indicated in the Merit deliberation letters.
2. Members of the Merit committee are elected to three-year terms by ballot of the full department faculty no later than the fourth Monday in April. Ballots will not require faculty voter identification.
3. *Full department faculty* is defined as full-time Communication Studies faculty in the ranks of lecturer, pre-tenure, and tenured professors.
4. A quorum of 75% of COMM faculty members is required for election of Merit members.
5. All committee members are elected by a simple majority vote.
6. All members with 2 years of full-time Department service are eligible for election. Nominations are by self-nomination or peer nomination from slate of eligible faculty members prepared by the Merit Chair and Department Chair.
7. Membership elections should be staggered to retain half of the elected committee members each year. The first year of committee election (to begin Fall 2019) should include two members elected to two-year terms to facilitate a staggered committee turnover in 2021. The standard three-year terms will commence with the 2021 elections. (This provision will be struck after 2021).
8. Faculty may not be elected to two consecutive three-year terms.
9. If an elected member's status changes (e.g tenure-track to tenured professor), the faculty member no longer fulfills the membership requirements. A special election will be held to select a new member to complete the term.
10. Committee members on sabbatical or other leave will be replaced on a semester (or yearly) basis by a vote of the full department faculty. The faculty member resumes their service upon return from leave.
11. If there are no faculty available in a rank to fulfill a position, the position will convert to an at-large position for the remainder/entirety of the term.

12. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Merit committee are elected by separate paper ballot of the full department faculty after all committee members have been elected for the upcoming year.
13. The Merit Chair and Vice-Chair each serve a two-year term. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be elected by the fourth Monday in April and shall assume responsibility starting in September of that year.
14. The Merit Chair will have general oversight of the process of Faculty Evaluation for Reappointment and Merit. Specifically, the Merit Chair shall be responsible for convening, chairing, and reporting the results of all Merit Committee meetings; coordinating the revision of Merit documents and advising full-time faculty about the Reappointment and Merit processes.
15. The Vice-Chair shall assist the Chair in the responsibilities identified above and certify all paper ballots for the full department faculty. The Merit Chair and Vice-Chair are also responsible for completing all forms related to committee review and votes.

B. COMM Tenure, Promotion, Third-year pre-tenure, 5 year comprehensive Review Committee Structure.

1. Membership on the Tenure committee will comprise all tenured faculty and the COMM Department Chair who serves ex officio and does not vote. Non-voting status of the Department Chair will be indicated in the Tenure and three-year deliberation letters.
2. The Tenure committee will convene only when tenure, promotion, or three-year reviews are due.
3. Tenured faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Tenure and three-year Committee providing they attend all deliberations and meetings.
4. The chair of the convened Tenure and three-year review committee is elected by paper ballot of the full department faculty no later than the fourth Monday in April. Ballots will not require faculty voter identification.
5. *Full department faculty* is defined as full-time Communication Studies members in the rank of lecturer, tenure-track, and tenured professors.
6. A quorum of 75% of full-time faculty members is required for election of the Tenure and three-year review committee chair.
7. All tenure decisions require a minimum of three voting members. If the department does not have three tenured voting faculty at the time of a tenure decision, the department needs to seek assistance from outside the department.
 - A. The applicant can provide the Department Chairperson with three to five suggested tenured faculty members from outside the department to be invited to join the COMM Tenure committee for the applicant's tenure review.

B. If more than one applicant exists in a single year, each applicant will be allowed to provide three to five outside tenured faculty for their tenure review.

C. The Department Chair invites outside members from the

applicant's list to meet the minimum required number of three Tenure committee members for the tenure review.

III. Policies and Procedures

Evaluation Portfolios

- A. The responsibility for presenting material for the annual review, reappointment, third-year review, merit, promotion, tenure, or five-year comprehensive reviews rest with the faculty member. The committee can review only materials submitted by the candidate.
- B. Guided by department, department Merit chair, college, and university criteria, the faculty member shall have the responsibility of making distinctions between the various categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, and shall include such distinctions as they deem appropriate in their narrative statements and other documentation relevant to each evaluation portfolio section.
- C. All faculty are responsible for creating a portfolio of effective teaching, advising, research/creative/professional work, and service to be submitted to the Merit Chair by the third Friday in June. Evaluation portfolios shall be organized, indexed, and placed in a three-ring binder as outlined by the Provost's Office.
- D. Evaluation portfolios will be made available to committee members during normal working hours. Binders should not be removed from campus or kept overnight by reviewers.
- E. Required materials for Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment, and Comprehensive Five-Year Review and other reviews are listed in the University ART document.
- F. Required materials for annual Merit reviews must include the following documents:
 - 1. Executive Summary Cover Sheet (See Appendix C)
 - 2. Completed and signed AR (Annual Report, Parts I & II) or CAR (Chairperson's Annual Report I & II) forms;
 - 3. Current curriculum vitae;
 - 4. Syllabi of courses taught during the year under review;
 - 5. Evaluation, as appropriate, of teaching and advising (student evaluations and grade distributions for courses taught).
 - 6. Peer Teaching Evaluations:
 - A. Tenure-track faculty must include Peer evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator. Two evaluations should take place each semester until third-year review and then once each semester until application for promotion and tenure.
 - B. Lecturers must include Peer evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator every odd-numbered review year or every year that a new course is taught.

- C. Tenured faculty must include Peer evaluation(s) of teaching signed by faculty member and evaluator every even-numbered review year.
7. Documentation of scholarship and service. More information is available in Section I.B. of the ART document.
- G. Evaluation portfolio materials for third-year review of faculty must include the following documents:
1. All items listed in section F
 2. Syllabi of courses taught in the previous two (2) years;
 3. Student and peer/chairperson evaluations of teaching and advising for the previous two (2) years and the fall semester of the current year.
 4. A reflective narrative statement in which the faculty member describes how they met (and integrated) teaching, advising, research, and service expectations based on their workload agreement for the period under review.
- H. Portfolio materials for promotion and/or tenure must include the following documents: all materials listed above (sections F, D, G from the faculty member's date of hire or last promotion.
- I. Evaluation portfolio materials for five-year comprehensive post-tenure review of tenured faculty must include the following documents:
1. All materials listed above in section F for the previous five (5) years;
 2. A minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching from the past five-year period, including one from the prior academic year.
 3. 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.
 4. A report outlining the candidate's plan for teaching, service, and scholarship for the next five year.
- J. If the faculty member or the Merit Chair, Tenure Chair or COMM chairperson participating in the evaluation process wishes to add a statement to the file rebutting a committee recommendation or clarifying information or statements in the file, this information must be included in the back of 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.
- K. If the COMM department chairperson includes information in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio, other than their evaluation, that specific information shall immediately be made known to the faculty member undergoing evaluation and before any evaluation at the next level of review takes place. Record of the faculty member's notification shall be tracked via the Promotions, Tenure, Reappointment, and Merit (PTRM) Document Review Transmittal Form Failure to notify the faculty within five (5) business days will result in the material being removed from the evaluation

portfolio.

Evaluation Procedures

- L. Committee deliberations are considered confidential.
- M. A quorum of 75% of voting Merit committee members is required for committee deliberations. Votes should take place immediately following deliberations.
- N. Faculty members being evaluated shall be informed in writing of committee decisions by the fourth Friday in October. First year faculty shall be informed in writing of the committee's decisions by the third Friday in January.
- O. The COMM Chairperson may prepare an independent recommendation on merit and/or reappointment and include it in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio. The COMM 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. The COMM Chairperson's recommendation letter will be added to the faculty member's evaluation portfolio after Merit Committee or Tenure Committee deliberations.
- P. Negative decisions shall be delivered in person by the COMM Department Chairperson or sent by certified mail to the candidate's home by the fourth Friday in October.
- Q. All votes regarding tenure, promotion, reappointment, merit, three-year review, and five-year comprehensive post-tenure reviews taken by any committee shall be by confidential ballot, signed with the Towson University ID number, and dated by the voting member, and tallied by the Merit chair and Co-Chair or the Tenure committee chair. The Merit and Tenure chairpersons shall forward a signed, dated report of the results of the vote and the committee's recommendations to the next level of review. The confidential ballots shall not be included in the faculty evaluation portfolio, but shall be forwarded under separate cover to the Provost, to be preserved with the tenure and promotion file until three (3) years following the faculty member's termination or resignation from the University.
- R. 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.
- S. Department committees should consistently and objectively evaluate faculty members on the standards listed in the department guidelines. Department committees should review and comment on numeric scores and student comments of course evaluations and report on them in a representative and proportional manner. Department committees may also review and comment on grade distribution data and on any correlation between grade distribution and course evaluations.
- T. Committee letters should reference (clearly cite, explain, and apply) department standards of teaching, scholarship, and service; connect them to a faculty member's

accomplishments with examples; and evaluate how the faculty member did not meet, met, or exceeded these department standards. Committee letters should reflect the main points of discussion, including dissent. Committee letters should employ a consistent format.

U. Tie Votes. Tie votes result in the following recommendations:

1. Promotion and Reappointment: tie votes for Promotion or reappointment result in a recommendation for Promotion or reappointment.
2. Tenure: A tie vote for Tenure results in a recommendation against tenure.
3. Merit: A tie vote for Merit results in a recommendation of the higher level of merit.

V. There are three kinds of appeals in the PTRM process: substantive, procedural, and appeals alleging discrimination. For a full discussion of appeals, see the University 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 COMM department chair and the department's Merit or Tenure committee 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."

V. Ratification and Amendment of COMM PTRM documents

1. Any amendment to the COMM PTRM documents will be developed by the Merit and Tenure committees.
2. All COMM PTRM documents must be distributed to full-time faculty in the department for input at least ten (10) business days prior to the full

- department faculty vote on the document.
3. Final approval of the department documents shall be by a 75% majority of the fulltime department faculty vote by ballot. Faculty on leave (sabbatical, medical leave, etc.) may submit their vote by proxy by notification to both the Merit Chair and Co-Chair.
 4. Faculty voting on the document should sign the voting roster to signify participation. The Merit Chair and Co-Chair can signify the proxy vote of a faculty member on leave.
 5. Prior to submission to the University PTRM committee, the department document, with Approval Form, shall be submitted to the college PTRM committee and the dean of the college for approval by the first Friday in December.
 6. Following approval by the college PTRM committee and the dean, the department PTRM document shall be delivered by the dean to the chairperson of the University PTRM committee by the second Friday in February.
 7. The department Merit 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.
 8. The COMM chairperson is responsible for assuring that the approved departmental PTRM documents are posted on the Towson University website.
 9. 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.
 10. 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.

IV. Department Standards for Merit

In conjunction with guidelines issued by the Chancellor or the Board of Regents, the “Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty” (SENTF) 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 COMM 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.

- B. Faculty members will choose, in consultation with the COMM department chairperson, appropriate percentages of teaching, scholarship, and service dependent upon activities determined annually.
- C. The University currently specifies a three-category merit policy for lecturers, tenure-track and tenured faculty: Not Meritorious, Satisfactory (Base Merit), and Excellent (Base Merit + 1 Performance Merit).
- D. Basic criteria for Merit are as follows:

1. *Not Meritorious*: Performance fails adequately to meet the standards and expectations of the Department, College and University.
2. *Satisfactory*: Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the Department, College and University.
3. *Excellent*: Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories. Teaching and scholarship are weighted more heavily than service.

E. Further description of *Not Meritorious*: Performance that does not meet the Satisfactory standard in one or more of the basic areas of the faculty role of teaching and advising or research and scholarship or service. Faculty members who do not meet the stated standards of Satisfactory performance will not be awarded Merit.

F. Further description *Satisfactory* (Base Merit) – Performance that is competent in all basic areas of the faculty role and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department. Satisfactory performance means that faculty members: (i) has fulfilled their workload agreements in the areas of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service; (ii) have been available to students for consultation and advising during office hours; (iii) have met all classes as scheduled; (iv) have demonstrated a commitment to collegiality and citizenship; (v) have participated in governance at the department level; (vi) have provided evidence of a strong teaching commitment; (vii) have provided evidence of ongoing research and scholarly work; and (viii) have provided evidence of a commitment to service, which may include activities at the department, college, and/or university level. Service to the community and/or the profession, which is consistent with the mission of the university, is also valued.

The Department recognizes that there are many ways faculty members may demonstrate Satisfactory performance. Examples are designed to guide both faculty and the Merit Committee rather than being an exclusive list.

Examples of *Satisfactory Teaching* may include but are not limited to:

- refinement of course materials and syllabi;
- Student evaluations and/ or peer reviews that reflect a perception of competence and a strong commitment to teaching and to student performance;
- active, demonstrable involvement in student advising.
- innovations in instruction or instructional technology;

Examples of *Satisfactory Research and Scholarly Work* may include but are not limited to:

- documented progress on a publishable writing project;
- a presentation of a scholarly paper or other scholarly work at a professional conference;
- submission of a grant or fellowship application in one's field of professional expertise.
- The publication of a technical or consulting report for a professional or community organization
- speaker on panel presentations, poster sessions, conference workshops, conference course instruction

Examples of *Satisfactory Scholarship and Professional Development* for **Lecturers** may include but are not limited to:

- Reports on thoughtful patterns of scholarly reading and study that reflect efforts to achieve currency in the COMM discipline and related interdisciplinary fields;
- Conference participation, including attendance at educational workshops, workshops directed by COMM professional organizations;
- Courses, workshops, and technical/course pedagogy offered by academic and COMM professional organization;
- Museum-going, attendance at performances, forums, or other documented activities that demonstrate scholarly activity or professional growth.

Examples of *Satisfactory Service* to the University may include but are not limited to:

- active service to the department. Mere membership on a department committee does not constitute satisfactory service to the department.
- active participation on a college or university committee to which the faculty member has been appointed or elected; service as a peer reviewer for a scholarly journal;
- application of professional expertise in the community in a way that serves the mission of the university.

G. Further description of *Excellent* (Base Merit Plus) – Performance that meets the Satisfactory standard in the basic areas of the faculty role: teaching and advising; and research and scholarship; and service. In addition, to be Excellent, performance must substantially exceed the Satisfactory standard in one or more of these areas of the faculty role.

H. The COMM Department recognizes that there are many ways faculty members may demonstrate Excellent (Merit Plus) performance. Examples are designed to guide both faculty and the Merit Committee, rather than being an exclusive list.

I. Although Lecturers 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, may contribute to demonstrating scholarly activity or professional growth during reviews.

Examples of *Excellent (Merit Plus) Teaching* may include but are not limited to:

- Outstanding scores on student reviews and course grade distributions that demonstrate rigor in the classroom
- achievement of a significant internal or external instructional grant or fellowship;
- supervision of a student research project that earns distinction outside the department;
- Teaching Awards or accolades from University and Professional Organizations;
- Demonstrated mentorship of student success in classes;
- Creation of new courses that advance the Department and University curricular mission;
- Demonstrated connection of classroom activities to community through civic engagement projects with community partners, local and state organizations, and other forms of deep engagement bridging course content and community action.

Examples of *Excellent (Merit Plus) Research or Scholarship* may indicate performance include but are not limited to:

- publication of an article or chapter in a peer-reviewed journal or book in one's field of professional expertise;
- publication of a book in one's field of professional expertise;
- publication of a significant applied work of scholarship in one's field of expertise;
- publication and dissemination of a significant media production;
- invitation to guest edit an edition of a Scholarly journal
- award of a USM or BOR research award
- award of a significant external grant or fellowship

Examples of *Excellent (Merit Plus) Scholarship or Professional Development for Lecturers* may include, but are not limited to:

- Acceptance and presentation of Scholarly papers at conferences
- Speaker on panel presentations, poster sessions, conference workshops, conference course instruction
- invited scholarly talks at other academic institutions, media, or community

- organizations that reflect the faculty member's areas of expertise
- similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers that provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development

Examples of *Excellent (Merit Plus) Service* may include but are not limited to:

- development or significant revision of an academic or institutional program;
- lead responsibility for the organization of major professional conference or a major conference related to one's field of professional expertise;
- assuming the leadership of a major university or college committee or task force

J. Relationship between Merit and Workload. There are three typical workload agreements in the COMM Department: 4/4, 4/3, and 3/3. The Chair's workload is different from these workloads and is determined in consultation with the Dean.

1. Lectures and other faculty on a 4/4 load are expected to devote 80% of their effort on teaching. The remaining effort should include service to the department and college and interaction with scholarship that maintains currency in the knowledge base of Communication Studies or related interdisciplinary fields.
2. Faculty on a 4/3 load are teacher/scholars and 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. Evidence of quality teaching remains very important, and there must be effective service.
4. The most important merit criterion for the Chair is evaluation of their leadership of the Department. Teaching, research/creative/professional activity, and service must also be considered in relation to the percentage of effort declared in each category.
5. If a faculty member's workload varies significantly from the profiles discussed above, the COMM Merit and Tenure Committee chairs will develop written merit standards specifically for that faculty member. For example, a tenure-track director of forensics will need a specific workload agreement.

K. Merit Evaluation of Department Chairperson.

Chairs shall be evaluated in the additional category of leadership. Chair activities are reported as part of their annual review on the CAR form. Departments shall recognize in

their evaluation of chairs a distribution of responsibilities and expectations consistent with the chair's workload agreements. Evaluators will recognize that chair responsibilities may involve personnel matters or dealings with students governed by confidentiality, as well as other activities not readily visible to colleagues; such matters may not be reported or documented in detail. Evaluators will nevertheless make judgments about the consistency, creativity, and fairness with which a chair has carried out the responsibilities of leadership, consistent with university policies and the responsibilities defined for the chair. Please consult University document 3-11-00 for guidance <https://www.towson.edu/about/administration/policies/documents/policies/03-11-00-academic-department-chairpersons-roles-and-responsibilities.pdf>. Program directors who supervise faculty and who prepare annual reports on their activities may also be evaluated for leadership consistent with the proportion of their time committed to such work under their workload agreements.

L. Merit evaluation for faculty administrative duties performed on reassigned time. All faculty performing administrative duties on reassigned time should complete an Executive Summary form reporting their activities and accomplishments for the year. The COMM chairperson should complete a short evaluation of the faculty member's efforts to be included with the executive summary. (See Appendix C).

V. Departmental Standards and Evaluations for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

Standards for Teaching

Teaching is the central purpose of Towson University and therefore all faculty recommended for reappointment, promotion and 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.

- A. Teaching – may take a variety of forms, including the use of new technology formats, 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. *See Appendix A for specific details on Teaching Evaluations.*
- B. Evaluation of teaching may take many forms and should consider classroom performance (as well as other venues for teaching) and the varied forms of investment faculty make in preparation for teaching. 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. Evidence for New Instructional Procedures from the Annual Review form

C. Teaching Standards for *Reappointment*:

1. Knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field;
2. Refinement, updating, and improvement of courses that one teaches;
3. 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;
4. Carefully planned and well-organized course syllabi;
5. Availability to students; and
6. Strong evidence of potential for meeting the standards for tenure at the time of the tenure decision.

D. Teaching Standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Standards 1-6 listed under reappointment
2. Effective teaching, as evidenced by:
 - A. Appropriate and effective testing, evaluation, and grading of students' performance;
 - B. Creation of new courses, including those supporting the university's mission of interdisciplinary studies and Study Abroad experiences.
 - C. Content of courses and teaching processes are supportive of department mission;
 - D. Responsiveness to cultural and individual difference;
 - E. Effective instruction as measured by peer evaluation;
 - F. Effective instruction as measured by student evaluation;
 - G. Recognition in the department, College, University, and professional organizations of the quality of one's teaching.

E. Standards for promotion to Professor:

1. The standards listed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor;
2. Excellence in teaching; and
3. Demonstrated leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching.

F. Advising is an important faculty responsibility. The COMM department assigns academic advising to specific faculty as an administrative duty on reassigned time. Standards for all full-time faculty advisors should include:

1. Accessible to students for advising sessions;
2. Schedule formal advising hours each semester;
3. Be familiar with current policies 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)

Standards for Scholarship

- A. The evaluation of faculty scholarship shall be based on written evidence of the faculty member's commitment to a discipline or an interdisciplinary specialty and of continuing professional development and demonstrated scholarly growth. Scholarship may take many forms, including the scholarship of Application, Discovery, Integration, or Teaching. Regardless of type, faculty members shall be reviewed for continuing professional development and currency in their academic fields, as affirmed by its community of scholars and as demonstrated by the scholarly materials in the faculty member's evaluation portfolio.
- B. Whatever type or types of scholarship the faculty member pursues, a record of scholarly growth sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion shall include evidence that the faculty member's completed work has met the tests of dissemination and validation, meaning that the work has been made available in a form to which an interested scholarly or public community will have ready access and that the work has been reviewed and affirmed by scholarly peers. A faculty member's portfolio sufficient for the granting of tenure or promotion should demonstrate a sustained scholarly agenda resulting in published work consistent with the standards outlined below.
- C. Scholarly papers accepted for delivery at conferences external to the University, invited scholarly talks at other institutions whether domestic or international, and similar presentations involving review or recognition by scholarly peers may all provide evidence of scholarly engagement and development. Scholarly papers may mark progress toward completed work in annual or comprehensive reviews but they may not substitute for the pattern of published work required in evaluation for tenure or promotion.
- D. The COMM Merit and Tenure Committees look 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.

- E. The COMM Department seeks a minimum of five pieces of peer-reviewed published scholarship for a positive recommendation for tenure. While five pieces of peer-reviewed scholarship are the minimum requirements, the Department of Communication Studies emphasizes a holistic approach to the tenure package. The pieces of scholarship will also be considered in conjunction with the scholarly agenda and trajectory of the candidate, and the teaching and service components. The five pieces of peer-reviewed published scholarship are the foundation of a strong tenure case, but do not guarantee a successful case.
- F. Peer-reviewed publications include but are not limited to peer-reviewed journal articles, books, chapters in books, and exhibitions/performances in COMM and related Interdisciplinary fields.
- G. Additional kinds of scholarship. The following list scholarship/creative activity represent appropriate forms of scholarship for Tenure and Promotion including but not limited to:
1. Productions: Peer-reviewed performances, multi-media/digital projects.
 2. Successful awards of external grants and Fellowships in support of one's research and/or creative and performance activities
 3. Distinguished Scholarly Fellowship, Journal Editorial position, and visiting artist.
- H. Interdisciplinary work, which may also include both teaching and research, is a vital part of the activity of the modern university. The COMM Merit and Tenure Committees will evaluate interdisciplinary and International work as having equal weight with work done entirely within COMM.
- I. COMM also recognizes the University's support of the Boyer model—Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, Scholarship of Teaching—as 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, and websites, etc.
- J. Examples of application of the Boyer Model for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion may include the following:
1. The standards for *reappointment*:

- a. A clearly defined scholarship/creative agenda and focus;
- b. Expertise in methodologies appropriate to one's scholarship and/or creative agenda; and
- c. Strong evidence of potential for meeting standards at the time of the tenure decision.
- d. Currency in the knowledge base that encompasses one's field of inquiry;
- e. Application of that knowledge base to one's teaching, service, and other professional activities; and
- f. 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. the standards for reappointment; and
- b. Award of terminal degree.

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

- a. Standards a-f for reappointment and “standards for promotion to *Assistant Professor*”;
- 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 and creative work to appropriate publics;
- e. Recognition by others of the quality of one's scholarship or artistic expression.
- f. Continued interaction with others internally and externally who share one's knowledge base; and
- g. 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.
- h. Efforts to obtain funding to support one's scholarship or creative and pedagogical goals;

4. 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;
- c. Distinction in the quality of one's scholarship or creative activity.
- d. Generation of new theories and models based on the knowledge base in one's field.

Standards for Service

A. 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. Service will be evaluated by following standards at different levels.

B. Service to the University

1. 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; and
 - 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; and
 - 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 standards for tenure plus these additional standards:
 - a. Leadership in addressing important institutional issues; and
 - 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 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.

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. The standard for tenure and promotion;
 - b. Leadership in addressing issues in one's field; and
 - 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. The standard for tenure and promotion;
 - b. Leadership in collaboratively addressing issues important to the community; and
 - c. Distinction in the quality of one's service or performance.

VI. The Role of Tenured Faculty and Procedures for Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Reviews

The Role of Tenured Faculty

- A. Tenured professors are a critical resource within the University community, possessing a range of skills and knowledge which can contribute significantly to the quality of the institution in a variety of ways. They are expected to provide guidance and assistance to more junior staff in developing their capacity for teaching and research.
- B. Tenured faculty at the rank of *Professor* provide academic leadership, primarily through demonstrating and fostering excellence in research, teaching, professional activities and policy development at a variety of levels – within the Towson COMM academic unit, the institution, and Communication Studies academic discipline.
- C. COMM Professors are expected to exhibit significant and demonstrable leadership to the department and to mentor junior faculty in a variety of ways. Professors should model collegial behavior in their role as senior faculty who must bridge the historical roots of the department with necessary visionary steps that foster a vibrant department for current and future faculty, staff, and students. Professors must also consider their special status within the university and recognize their obligation to support the professional arc of their junior colleagues while also caretaking their continued academic vibrancy.
- D. Professors should be role models in their relationships with students, faculty, and staff

at all levels. They should be accessible in the department and take part in the community life of the department, college, and University. They should be leaders in the positive promotion of the COMM department and should model citizenship in the greater Towson University community.

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, e of the University ART policy.
- C. Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review decisions are separate from individual year Merit decisions, but one portfolio may be prepared for both reviews.

VII. 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 COMM Tenure 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 aiding where issues or shortcomings in the candidate's profile are identified and encouragement where progress is deemed satisfactory or exemplary. The COMM Tenure committee evaluations of a candidate's interim progress will become part of the faculty member's file at the department level and shared with the 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 COMM Tenure committee as outlined in Section I.B. 3.c. of the ART policy.
- C. The COMM Tenure committee will evaluate the materials and prepare a clear, written statement of progress toward tenure addressing teaching/advising, a plan for and evidence of scholarly/creative activity, and service and other relevant criteria. This statement:
 - 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 COMM Department Chair by the third Friday in January.
 - F. Feedback should be both in writing and in a face-to-face meeting with the COMM chair and the COMM Tenure 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 COMM department may be expected to serve a more extensive function and the COMM department may provide more extensive feedback to the candidate.

VIII. PTRM Calendar

Towson University Annual Review, Reappointment, Third-Year Review, Merit, Promotion, Tenure and Comprehensive Review Calendar (All deadlines are final deadlines)

Fourth Monday in April

Department-wide election held to form Promotion, Reappointment, Five-year Post-Tenure, and Merit Committee.

The first Friday in May

Department and college Tenure and Merit committees are formed (elections for membership on the college committee are already completed). Merit Committee elects Chair, Vice-Chair.

The Third Friday in June

- A. All faculty members submit an evaluation portfolio, to be placed in the appointed area.
- 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.

The First Tuesday in September

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 University and COFAC guidelines.

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 PTR committee (if necessary).
- C. First year faculty members must finalize the Statement of Standards and Expectations for New Tenure-Track Faculty (SENTF) with the department chairperson.

The Fourth Friday in September

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 Merit and Tenure and Three-year review committees report 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 Merit and Tenure and Three-year review committees 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 review Committees' written recommendation with record of the vote count, and the written recommendation of the department chairperson, are forwarded by the department PTR and Merit chairpersons 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 Merit 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 Merit 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.

IX. REFERENCE SOURCES

Additional information concerning tenure and promotion can be found on the Towson University website www.towson.edu

Recommended documents for faculty review:

Link to Faculty Handbook: <http://www.towson.edu/provost/resources/toc>.

Link to Third-year review policy is available on the Academic Resources web page:

<http://www.towson.edu/provost/resources/toc.asp>

X. Appendix A: COMM 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.

Student Evaluation Process

Student evaluations are required for all courses taught, excluding internships and independent studies. A University-developed course evaluation instrument has been developed and is used by various academic departments, including COMM. Using the StudentVoice 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.

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

XI. Appendix B: COMM Peer Evaluation Policy and Forms

Peer Evaluation Policy

- A. Classroom visits are required when faculty being considered for Merit, reappointment, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and 5-year comprehensive post-tenure review.
- B. For tenure-track faculty members, a minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted per academic year.
- C. For tenured faculty members, a minimum of two (2) peer observations shall be conducted during the academic year after a faculty member declares their intention to apply for promotion to Professor.

- D. A minimum of two peer observations shall be conducted during the Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review period.
- E. The COMM Department Chairperson in consultation with the Administrative Assistant will assign reviewers on a yearly basis. The COMM department chairperson should strive for diversity of reviewers for each candidate so that a candidate has a variety of reviewers over the years leading up to application for tenure and/or promotion.
- F. Faculty member and reviewers should coordinate a mutually acceptable date for the peer review. No peer review should take place without advance notice.
- G. 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.
- H. After the faculty member receives the completed evaluation, a conference must be scheduled, unless it is waived by the person being evaluated.
- I. The written evaluation can be modified after the conference, if both faculty members involved agree.
- J. The faculty member being evaluated can append a response to the evaluation.
- K. The faculty member being evaluated can also request an additional evaluation (from a different evaluator).
- L. Two signed copies of the evaluation must be made: one for the person being evaluated; and one for the Department Chair to be added to the Department Personnel File.
- M. A faculty member being evaluated for tenure, promotion, Third Year Review, or Five-Year Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review must include a reflective narrative on his/her teaching. Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall include a narrative statement about individual teaching philosophy, and an interpretation of student and/or peer/chairperson evaluations.



Communication Studies

Classroom Visitation Report

Evaluation of teaching by faculty colleagues is intended to promote improvements of teaching as well as to gather evidence of teaching effectiveness. The Department's best practices for peer evaluations are attached here, but the following guidelines should be considered when planning and participating in this process:

1. The date of the visit shall be arranged at least one week in advance of the class period.
2. The visited and visiting faculty members will have a pre-visit conversation (in-person or via email), at least one day prior to the class period so that the visited member may discuss objectives for the course, provide a syllabus, etc.

3. The visiting faculty member will observe one class session (or at least 50% of a three-hour class session).
4. Within one week after the visit, an open and professional post-visit conference will be held to discuss the observations made by the visiting faculty members.
5. Within two weeks after the visit, each faculty member will have completed and signed the Classroom Visitation Report.

Visited Faculty Member:

Visiting Faculty Member:

Course and Section:

Date of Classroom Visitation:

Topic Being Taught:

Date and Brief Summary of Pre-Visit Meeting (suggestions for discussion include class objectives and goals, accomplishments thus far in the semester, areas of particular attention, questions and concerns, overview of students):

Classroom Visit:

Class Organization and Management (How was the class session organized? How is the instructor's time management for the class session? How is the pacing and scope of material in the class session? How was the instructor's classroom management?):

Class Objectives What is the class purpose? What were the objectives for the class session? Did those objectives fit into the larger course objectives and/or student learning outcomes for the major?):

Relevance of Material (To what degree was the content appropriate for the class? Were the teaching techniques appropriate and relevant to the topic and to the students?):

Special Techniques Employed (What teaching techniques did the instructor use? Did the instructor use any special techniques in the classroom? Did the instructor use technology? Did the instructor consider student diversity in the content and techniques used for this class session? Did the instructor balance abstract and concrete content?):

Student Response (How is the classroom atmosphere? Was there evidence of learning as demonstrated through student production or discussion? Was there evidence of student enthusiasm for the content?):

Evaluation of Syllabus (checklist of required material and evaluation of content and structure of

syllabus):

General Impressions/Suggestions for Improvement:

Post-Classroom Visit Conference:

Comments by Visitor or Visited Faculty Member of Post-Visitation Conference:

Signature of Visiting Faculty: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Visited Faculty: _____ Date: _____

Three copies with original signatures: one for visiting faculty, one for visited faculty, one for department file.



Peer Evaluation Summary of Best Practices:

1. Faculty involvement in developing the process is essential.
2. Good peer review processes include several critical characteristics—openness, mutually agreed-upon criteria, adherence to developed procedures, written feedback at all stages, discussion of the results, and methods for monitoring and revising the process.
3. Peers are the best source of judgment in several areas of teaching performance.
4. Effective peer review of classroom teaching includes the following steps:
 - a. A pre-observation discussion (evaluation should receive a copy of the syllabus and can ask questions, such as: What do you want the students to have learned by the end of this class? How does this class fit in with the overall course? What pre-class work will the students have done for this class? **Are there specific aspects of the class on which the instructor would like to receive feedback?**)
 - b. A classroom observation (with identified criteria, such as clarification of class purpose, organization of class structure, reinforcement of major concepts, pacing and scope, classroom atmosphere, consideration of diversity, class management, balance between abstract and concrete, classroom assessment)

- c. A post-observation debriefing (in-person meeting where discussion centers on the pre-observation discussion notes and class observation notes)
- d. A written summary documenting the process (evaluator submits evaluation and both evaluator and faculty member evaluated sign the document)
- e. A reflective statement by faculty member evaluated (faculty member evaluated reflects on the peer evaluation and writes a reflection detailing how the evaluation can be used to further enhance his/her teaching—potentially answers questions such as: What did you learn about yourself? What did you discover about your teaching? Subject matter knowledge? What was confirmed for you about your teaching? What ideas have you developed as a result of this experience?)



Syllabus Checklist

General course information

1. ___ Department, course title, course number, and section number
2. ___ Course term, class times, and location
3. ___ Faculty name and contact information (phone number and e-mail)
4. ___ Office location and office hours (see p. 3 for faculty office hours policy)
5. ___ Description of course as it appears in the university catalog
6. ___ Course prerequisites and enrollment restrictions, if any
7. ___ Course objectives (i.e., learning outcomes). List relevant Core Curriculum category learning objectives if the course is part of the university Core category. Contact chair for the course objectives established by the department; course objectives must be same across multiple sections of the same course.
8. ___ Brief description of the course content
9. ___ A clear explanation that details how participation is graded so that students cannot question the grade (if applicable)
10. ___ Textbook(s): separated between the required, the recommended, and other required resources, if applicable. Additional educational resources are required for the graduate section of UG/G combined courses
11. ___ A tentative course calendar or schedule (subjects to be covered, a timetable for coverage, due dates for assignments, and exam dates), including the *final exam date and time according to the university final exam schedule*. A coverage plan during anticipated faculty absences must be included
12. ___ A description of readings, tests, papers, projects, and participation, etc. Connection of each assignment to course learning outcome is recommended for program assessment purposes.
13. ___ A plus-minus (+/-) grading system (Note: TU undergraduate final grades are A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, D+, D, F, FX, S, U, PS, or I) and the range of values that correspond to each final letter grade

14. ____ The relative weight of each test and assignment towards the course grade

Course policies

15. ____ A clearly expressed attendance policy ([Faculty Handbook, Ch. 6, Sect. IX](#))
16. ____ Policy regarding late submission of work, including make-ups
17. ____ Academic integrity policy as it relates to grades for the course, consistent with TU Academic Integrity Policy. Must reference Website by providing URL:
<http://towson.edu/studentaffairs/policies/>. For this policy, please use the exact language in the “Common Language for all Syllabi” section.
18. ____ A statement regarding accommodations for students with disabilities and a Website URL of the Disability Support Services at <http://www.towson.edu/dss/>. For this policy, use the language in the “Common Language for all Syllabi” section.
19. ____ A statement about liability of student work. For this policy, use the language in the “Common Language for all Syllabi” section.
20. ____ COFAC Civility Code for classroom behaviors. For this policy, use the language in the “Common Language for all Syllabi” section. In addition, list specific examples of expected classroom behaviors.
21. ____ Weapons Policy. For this policy, use the language in the “Common Language for all Syllabi” section.
22. ____ A statement that students may not attempt a class for the third time without prior permission from the Academic Standards Committee
23. ____ Department policy statement on plagiarism and cheating.

Recommended Syllabi Information

1. ____ The Department of Communication Studies logo
2. ____ A list of materials on library reserve, if any
3. ____ Standards you use in determining differences in grades
4. ____ A note about the instructor’s right to change syllabus with an advance notice
5. ____ Policy on cell phone and laptop use
6. ____ Information about students’ course evaluation
7. ____ Sexual Harassment Policy
8. ____ Emergencies Statement

XII. Appendix C: Annual Merit Executive Summary Form (*Place this form at the start of your Merit review portfolio*)

This 1-2 page executive summary serves as a cover sheet. The executive summary should be a **bulleted list** of your **most outstanding contributions** for the year under review. This summary **should not be a list** of everything you do for the year under review, but rather the **accomplishments you want to highlight**. Consider this executive summary your personal highlight reel.

Name:

AY:

Teaching Only highlight your significant teaching accomplishments and delete bullets that do not apply.

- Courses taught
- New courses prepared
- Student Feedback
- Grade distribution range
- Student successes
- Teaching awards
- Advising accomplishments
- Other teaching accomplishments

Scholarship Only highlight your significant scholarship accomplishment and delete bullets that do not apply.

- Publications
- Presentations
- Awards
- Grants/fellowships awarded
- Scholar in Residence/invited guest lectures
- Other Scholarship accomplishments

Service Only highlight your significant service accomplishments and delete bullets that do not apply.

- Leadership positions and accomplishments. Indicate if you were elected/appointed to the position (department/collective/university/discipline/profession)
-
- Other committee roles and accomplishments
- Community service accomplishments
- Service awards
- Other service accomplishments

(This summary does not replace the university requirements for milestone years [tenure, promotion, 5-year review]; consult the Provost's Promotion, Tenure, and Five-Year Comprehensive Review Material Preparation during those years).