

# DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, MERIT, CONTRACT RENEWAL, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF TENURED AND PROBATIONARY FACULTY<sup>1</sup>

Department of Visual Communication & Technology Education  
College of Technology  
Bowling Green State University

(as amended October 3, 2006)

## I. Department Policy

The Department of Visual Communication & Technology Education explains, by means of this policy statement, the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the annual evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty for salary changes (merit), promotion, tenure, and contract renewal. This statement complies with the policies of the Board of Trustees of Bowling Green State University, the *Academic Charter*, and the College of Technology. This statement is provided to all faculty in the department upon request or annually and a copy is maintained in the department office. It has been approved by the faculty of the department in accordance with department policies.

### A. Vision Statement

The department recognizes that, in matters relating to annual review, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure of faculty, Bowling Green State University supports performance consistent with the university's aspiration to be the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation. As defined by the *Academic Charter* (Article II.A, Section A), "The persons who create and maintain the University constitute the University Community. There are five groups within this Community: students, faculty, administrators, administrative staff and classified staff." To achieve its objectives, the university expects faculty participation in the interdependent areas of teaching, scholarly work, and service that is of the highest quality, grounded in intellectual discovery, and guided by rational discourse and civility.

The essence of this department's evaluation process is to improve faculty members' performance through appropriate evaluation and timely feedback. Careful and consistent application of the criteria and standards in evaluating faculty performance in teaching,

---

<sup>1</sup> The original template for this document was approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 1997. The procedural portions of this document (found in 1-B of the *Academic Charter*) may be amended by the Faculty Senate when the document entitled "Review Process for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion of Tenured and Probationary Faculty" prepared by the Task Force on Tenure Promotion and Merit and the Faculty Welfare Committee is debated at future meetings of the Faculty Senate.

Within the VC& TE department, this document provides the foundation for the development of "success plans" and for the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) template.

scholarly work, and service are of fundamental importance in achieving the department's mission and in protecting the rights of the individual faculty member. Department review processes are to be conducted dearly, openly, responsibly, and fairly.

## **B. The Academic Charter**

The University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure (section B-1.C) and the statement on Evaluation of Faculty Personnel (section B-1.D), as contained in the *Academic Charter*, identify the three relevant evaluation criteria as teaching, scholarly work, and service and define the basic requirements for merit, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. As stated in the *Academic Charter* (section B-1.D.2.a), for promotion policies "Academic units may develop more specific or more rigorous criteria in teaching, service, or scholarly activity, provided that such criteria are equitable and appropriate and provided that they do not conflict with the criteria below and, in a department/ school, with the criteria of the majority of the faculty members of the academic unit." As stated in the *Academic Charter* for tenure policies, section B-1.D.2.b, "Either academic units or colleges may develop more precise statements of what is expected under each criterion, but may not add other criteria." All such statements shall be approved by the appropriate academic unit or college tenured faculties . . ." These criteria and standards allow for differentiation among faculty members with regard to their roles and contributions within the department in fulfillment of the, department, college and university mission.

### **1. Faculty Appointments**

The university defines three types of faculty appointments (temporary, lecturer, and regular) and distinguishes between two types of regular appointment (probationary and tenured). Temporary and lecturer appointments are discussed in section B-1.C.2 (a) and (b) of the *Academic Charter*. Probationary appointments and policies associated with such appointments are described in section B-1.C.2. (c) of the *Academic Charter* which includes statements on the probationary period, the review process, and termination. Tenured appointments and the policies associated with such appointments are described in section B-I.C.3 of the *Academic Charter*, which includes statements on the meaning, obligations, and termination of tenure.

### **2. Annual Review for Reappointment**

The *Academic Charter* mandates a comprehensive annual review of all temporary faculty members at section B-1.D.4, lecturers at B-I.C.2.b.3, and probationary faculty members at B-I.C.2.c.1.d. for purpose of contract renewal and assigns the primary responsibility for that review to the department. If negative, the annual review of a temporary, lecturer, or probationary faculty member may result in the rejection of that faculty member for contract renewal. For probationary faculty members, the overriding question to be considered by the department and the dean

during the annual review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

### **3. Review for Tenure**

The department has the primary responsibility for evaluating probationary faculty for tenure. In addition to annual reviews, the *Academic Charter* at B-1.D2.b. mandates that a probationary faculty member be valuated no later than the next-to-last year of the probationary appointment. Probationary faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the probationary period. Because department and college review committees apply tenure standards without discounted expectations based on a shorter probationary period, faculty members are discouraged from seeking early tenure decisions unless there are compelling reasons for doing so.

### **4. Review for Promotion**

The department also has the primary responsibility for the comprehensive review of all faculty members nominated for promotion. The qualifications for assistant professor, associate professor and professor are described in B-1.D.2.a.1.(b ), (c), and (d) of the *Academic Charter*. The department may stipulate criteria and standards for promotion that differentiate among the ranks with regard to their expected contributions to the department's performance as long as those criteria and standards do not conflict with the provisions of the *Academic Charter* and of the college.

### **5. Review for Merit**

Finally, the department has the primary responsibility for making all recommendations of salary changes (merit) for faculty (Section B-1.D.1 of the *Academic Charter*). Although the *Academic Charter* does not require that this be done annually, University practice has been to encourage such reviews on an annual basis to provide feedback on performance to the faculty member regardless of whether or not a merit salary allocation is made in a particular year.

## **II. Allocation of Effort**

Each faculty member needs to allocate time and effort to a wide range of teaching, scholarship, and service obligations that promote the mission and goals of the university, college, and department. All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how departmental expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weights will be used in assessing their performance.

### **A. Departmental Norms**

The department expects its faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort that approximates 50% teaching, 30% scholarly work, and 20% service. These weights will apply to most faculty who are carrying full teaching loads as defined by department policy. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives released time from teaching duties for administrative responsibilities, research, service, differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads or leaves granted by the *Academic Charter* or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment and no later than the beginning of the academic year. Probationary faculty will be evaluated for tenure based upon the department's standard allocation of effort.

Given the department's involvement in undergraduate degree programs, it considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a highly important component of a faculty member's record. Also, given the department's involvement in graduate degree programs at the masters level, it expects that all faculty will hold graduate faculty status and will contribute to the learning of graduate students, as appropriate. Based upon one's area of scholarly expertise and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, faculty should have the opportunity to provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars and make appropriate contributions to the recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students. In addition, faculty with appropriate areas of expertise are expected to participate in the direction of theses, projects, and/ or dissertations and to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty.

### **B. Individual Variations**

The department's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty in the department unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be in accord with the department's differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads, or leaves granted by the *Academic Charter* made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the department chair, and endorsed in writing by the dean of the college. Faculty on leave shall have the right to determine with the department chair the appropriate variation in the standard departmental allocation of effort in accordance with the purpose of the leave.

Although all percentage allocations are approximations and not exact time measurements, reasonable attempts must be made to ensure that a faculty member's allocation of effort is consistent with his/ her actual distribution of workload for instruction, scholarly work, and service responsibilities. Unless otherwise specified in writing, a faculty member's allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the period of any given academic year or contract period.

### **III. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Achievement in this area is of critical importance

to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include: undergraduate teaching; graduate teaching; instructional development; instruction-related professional development, and other contributions to student learning. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied.

#### **A. Evaluation of Undergraduate Instruction**

The department requires at least 4 performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching. Self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness per course taught during regular semesters and during summer sessions and results of student evaluations of courses taught are required; the faculty member must also supply at least two of the following: statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy; peer teaching observations and evaluations; documentation of student learning outcomes at the course level; student enrollment data; teaching awards and distinctions; and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching.

#### **B. Evaluation of Graduate Instruction**

Those faculty who have had the opportunity to actively participate in the teaching, advising, and thesis/project work of graduate students must submit indicators of teaching effectiveness in addition to those identified in III.A above that are applicable to graduate instruction. Graduate faculty members should maintain, as part of their teaching portfolio, records of thesis and project titles (with categories to show the status of the project and the faculty member's involvement on the committee) and at least 2 of the following performance indicators: records of letters of reference to assist placement or additional graduate study; success indicators of directed students (e.g., internships, assistantships, scholarly publications (within 2 years of graduation)); records of program promotion efforts; and records of extramural support secured for graduate students.<sup>2</sup>

#### **C. Evaluation of Instructional Development Efforts**

Departmental faculty are expected to continuously improve the curriculum. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instructional development may include: course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses; and innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

---

<sup>2</sup> Allocations established by departments are subject to review and concurrence by the Dean of the college and by the Provost and vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### **D. Evaluation of Instruction-related Professional Development Efforts**

Departmental faculty are expected to continuously improve their own teaching methods and effectiveness in accordance with their mentoring plan. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instruction-related professional development may include: conferences and workshops attended and courses taken to enhance instruction-related knowledge and skills.

#### **E. Evaluation of Other Contributions to Student Learning and Related Scholarship of Engagement<sup>3</sup>**

Faculty members may make other documented contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate such contributions may include: guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or cooperative work experiences (consistent with the expanded definition of scholarship: the Scholarship of Teaching); academic advising services provided to students; involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction; participation in university initiatives to create a campus-wide learning community; involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students; participation in university, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Other opportunities, as described in the SoE Standards Report (2005) are recognized in this area.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of teaching is this: *Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standards for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described in the university's governance documents and supportive of the instructional mission of the department, college, and university?*

#### **IV. Evaluation of Scholarly (Research/Creative) Work**

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or to the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all faculty members. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. An expanded definition of scholarship includes: the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, the Scholarship of Application, and the Scholarship of

---

<sup>3</sup> Further discussion of "scholarship" and the "scholarship of engagement" is included in Part IV

Teaching.<sup>4</sup> To facilitate evaluation, faculty members should maintain records of their scholarly work which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. Domains used in the evaluation of scholarly work include: publications/presentations/performances; sponsored program extramural support; scholarship of engagement; and reputation within one's discipline.<sup>5</sup>

#### **A. Evaluation of Publications/Presentations/Performances/Exhibits**

Publications, presentations and performances are the primary products of any scholarly work and thus central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/ exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are especially significant. So, too, are the publication of books, monographs, and other publications, presentations, performances, and exhibits resulting from applied research and consulting. Research and publication on pedagogy is the norm for some faculty- especially those whose discipline focuses on pedagogy - reflecting the Scholarship of Teaching. Scholarly work should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline.

#### **B. Evaluation of Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research or Creative Work**

In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support is an important external validation of the quality of research and creative activity. While no specific quantity of extramural research support is required for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, department expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. Performance indicators may include: number of grant applications submitted; agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects.

#### **C. Evaluation of Scholarship of Engagement**

---

<sup>4</sup> Definitions:

**Scholarship of Discovery** - traditional research activities, including creative work in the literary, visual, and performing arts; the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake

**Scholarship of Integration** - makes connections within and between disciplines; bringing new insight to bear on what might otherwise be isolated research

**Scholarship of Application** - applying knowledge and learning from that application - often in collaboration with external partners; theory and practice interact and improve each other

**Scholarship of Teaching** - a special case of the scholarship of application wherein the interaction between educator and learner becomes the focus of study and improvement

(Definitions drawn from: Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997) *Scholarship Assessed - Evaluation of the Professoriate*. Jossey-Bass.)

<sup>5</sup> **Documenting the Scholarship of Engagement at BGSU** - In making judgments about tenure, promotion, and merit, the best evaluation systems focus on the quality, significance, and impact of the work ... evaluation of engaged scholarship must involve assessment of community impact as well as significance for the discipline. (See the report of the Standards Committee on SoE, August 2005, p.8)

Faculty members may participate in institutionally- or faculty-initiated Scholarship of Engagement activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships and in applied research and private consulting. These activities may involve students and are consistent with an expanded definition of scholarship, focusing upon: the Scholarship of Integration and the Scholarship of Application. Activities must be consistent with the Conflict of Interest guidelines of the *Academic Charter*. Performance indicators may include: the collaborative relationship with partnering organizations; the significance and scope of the activity; the role of the faculty member in the activity; and/ or the documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments.

#### **D. Evaluation of Scholarly Reputation within the Discipline**

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's scholarly work is his/her reputation within his/her discipline. In the case of tenure and promotion, this quality may be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the department from authoritative reviewers external to the university who then use departmentally approved standards in their review.<sup>6</sup> The reviewers will include individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the departmental review committee. At least one reviewer must be selected from each list, with three to six letters included in the file.

*Note: Overemphasis on external review may lead to a distortion of the standard department allocation of effort since external reviewers cannot effectively evaluate university service and teaching contributions at BGSU.*

#### **E. Evaluation of Scholarship-related Professional Development Efforts**

Departmental faculty are expected to continuously improve the quality of their own scholarship in accordance with their mentoring plan. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of scholarship-related professional development may include: conferences and workshops attended and courses taken to enhance scholarship-related knowledge and skills.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in scholarly work that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of scholarly work is this: *Is the faculty member's performance in scholarly work consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal promotion, or tenure as described in university governance documents and specified by the department?*

#### **V. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness**

---

<sup>6</sup> External peer reviews are not required for annual review, for merit, nor for contract renewal.



Service contributions by faculty at the department, college, and university professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the university. Faculty seeking merit, tenure, contract renewal, or promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the university community and to the profession. For faculty seeking tenure and/ or promotion to associate professor, a record which documents continuous and active involvement in service is required. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record which documents significant service to the university and profession is required.

The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, university, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community (engagement); and contributions to a faculty member's profession. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation.

**A. Evaluation of Institutional Service Efforts**

These activities include participation in departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators used to evaluate university service may include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators used to evaluate administrative service may include: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others.

**B. Evaluation of Internal and External Community Service Efforts**

Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs (engagement). To be considered as community service appropriate for merit, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or university as qualifying. (Unless formally documented and appraised, activities of this type do not qualify as "scholarship of engagement", as described in IV.C, above.) All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used

to evaluate internal and/ or external community service may include: records of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognition; written statements or testimonials.

Other opportunities, as described in the SoE Standards Report (2005) are recognized in this area.

### **C. Evaluation of Professional Service Efforts**

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service may include: records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or extramural funding agencies; attendance at professional meetings and conferences; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; professional recognition; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; conference papers presented or sessions moderated that contribute to the profession.

### **D. Evaluation of Service Reputation within the Profession**

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's service work is his/her reputation within the profession. In the case of tenure and promotion, this quality may be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the department from authoritative reviewers external to the university. The reviewers will include individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the departmental review committee. At least one reviewer must be selected from each list, with three to six letters included in the file.

### **E. Evaluation of Service-related Professional Development Efforts**

Departmental faculty are expected to continuously improve the quality of their service activities in accordance with their mentoring plan. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of service-related professional development may include: conferences and workshops attended and courses taken to enhance service-related knowledge and skills.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in evaluating service is this: *Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal,*

