

**Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy**  
**Part I: University-Wide Processes Required by the CBA**  
**Approved February 6, 2020; Revised May 16, 2022**

**General Comments about Evaluation of Faculty**

This document is based on Article 14 (Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion) of the 2016-2019 Collective Bargaining Agreement between Bowling Green State University and Bowling Green State University Faculty Association – American Association of University Professors. Please refer to Article 14 of the CBA for full details appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion. In all instances, CBA language controls.

Pursuant to Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), bargaining unit faculty shall be advised by the Chair/Director regarding specific assignment duties and the substantive standards and procedures used in decisions for reappointment (based upon annual performance reviews and enhanced performance reviews), promotion, and tenure. Any additional expectations used by the Department/School shall be brought to the attention of the faculty members, and written copies of these additional expectations shall be readily available upon request. (Article 14, Sections 6.1.1., 7.1.1)

The Department/School shall have a written success plan for the professional development of each qualified rank faculty member (QRF) and probationary tenure-track faculty member (TTF). The Chair/Director shall communicate with the QRF to foster achievement and effectiveness in the areas of the QRF's assigned responsibilities. Similarly, the Chair/Director shall communicate with the probationary faculty member to foster achievement and effectiveness in all areas of teaching/librarian effectiveness, service, scholarly/creative activity. (Article 14, Sections 5.2, 6.1.2, 7.1.2)

The Chair/Director shall provide reasonable advanced notification of upcoming unit, college, or university schedules or deadlines for reappointment, annual performance reviews, enhanced performance reviews, tenure, or promotion. (Article 14, Sections 6.1.3, 7.1.3)

The college-level review committee provides independent recommendations to college deans and their designees on the dossiers of full-time faculty candidates for enhanced performance review, promotion, and tenure. The membership, responsibilities, and annual deadlines for the college-level review committee shall align with the common practices included in the "College-Level Review Committee (CLRC) Guidelines" jointly developed by the University and the BGSU-FA. (Article 14, Section 5.3)

The University-Level Review Committee provides independent advice to the Provost and designees on the dossiers of full-time faculty candidates for enhanced performance review, promotion, and tenure when there are one or more negative recommendations provided by the candidate's unit, Chair/Director, college committee, or Dean. The membership, responsibilities, and annual deadlines for the ULRC shall align with the common practices

included in the “University-Level Review Committee (ULRC) Guidelines” jointly developed by the University and the BGSU-FA. (Article 14, Section 5.4)

Differences in recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews may occur due to access of Chair/Director/Dean/Provost to documentation of performance-related issues not in the dossier but previously shared with the BUFM (e.g., outcomes of the discipline process, prior feedback on performance) directly pertaining to the BUFM’s teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, and/or service. In no instance other than annual performance reviews shall Chair/Director/Dean/Provost letters be the first time the performance-related issue is brought to the attention of the BUFM. (Article 14, Section 5.5)

All reviews shall require that the BUFM compile a dossier consisting of a curriculum vitae (CV), letter of appointment, and additional supporting materials required by the unit’s reappointment, tenure, and promotion policy. (Article 14, Section 5.6)

The RTP process shall not use data from the university’s online student course evaluation unless it has been adopted by an academic unit as part of their criteria, standards and procedures for RTP purposes according to the procedures stated in Sections 6.2.2.3, 6.4.2.3, 7.2.2.3, and 7.4.3 of Article 14 (Article 14, Section 10).

For BUFMs who are deemed unqualified to teach according to unit accreditation standards or who do not maintain the appropriate level of graduate faculty status required by their unit, the following are examples of remedies that may be developed:

- Change in teaching and/or service assignment to be determined by chair/director and dean
- Scholarship/creative activity success plan developed collaboratively between the BUFM and chair/director and approved by the dean (e.g., articulation of research/creative activity currently in progress or under development; long-term plan for the next five years)
- Other remedy agreed to by the BUFM, chair/director, and dean

When BUFMs experience periods of low or no productivity in scholarly/creative activity, opportunities to regain productivity and access to merit and promotion may be explored. These discussions may be initiated by BUFMs, chairs/directors, or deans and should result in a collaboratively developed plan to support a return to productivity (e.g., scholarly/creative internal grants, temporary reduction of teaching load).

BUFMs may undertake non-traditional scholarship and/or creative activities and submit those for merit, reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion consideration. Academic units are encouraged to credit non-traditional scholarship and/or creative outcomes and activities as a component of scholarly/creative activity achievement and effectiveness. Units should incorporate written standards and criteria for non-traditional scholarship and/or creative activities in the department’s/school’s “Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes” document as approved by the dean and provost (e.g., scholarship of engagement, community-based scholarship/creative work, virtual performances or exhibitions).

Consistent with amendments to the Ohio Revised Code Section 3345.45, the academic unit tenure and promotion processes for TTF will, where appropriate, include commercialization outcomes and activities (e.g., patents, intellectual property, licensing) consistent with their academic areas of specialization to count toward the evaluation of faculty scholarly/creative activity performance in recommendations for tenure and promotion. Faculty wishing to include commercialization outcomes and activities as a criterion within scholarship/creative activity should work closely with their chair/director and members of department/school to determine how commercialization outcomes (and activities will be included in scholarship/creative activity achievement and effectiveness. Academic units that include commercialization outcomes and activities as one of several pathways to scholarly/creative activity achievement and effectiveness for tenure and promotion of TTF should incorporate written standards and criteria for commercialization outcomes and activities in the Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document as approved by the Dean and Provost (e.g., two- three sentences describing the commercialization outcome/activity to count as up to two refereed publications or the equivalent).

### **Reappointment Process: ORF**

#### A. QRF in Years One through Six

QRF Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFMs) in years one through six shall be reviewed annually for reappointment, in the form of either an annual performance review (APR) or an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with this reappointment policy. The decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of current and previous APRs and/or EPRs, with emphasis on continuity of favorable performance or a clear record of improved performance. In the years in which an EPR is submitted, an APR shall not occur. (Article 14, Section 6.2.1)

Each academic unit shall have established written policies for annual reappointment of QRFs in years one through six regarding: (a) the criteria and standards used for APRs and EPRs, (b) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (c) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews, and (d) a process outlining the opportunity for BUFMs to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. (Article 14, Section 5.1, 6.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and standards and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the BUFMs of the academic unit and the Chair/Director, subject to endorsement of the Dean and Provost. (Article 14, Section 6.2.2.2). A description of the criteria and standards used for APRs and EPRs and academic unit procedures for creation and submission of APR and EPR materials can be found in each Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document. At the initiation of the University or unit faculty, the unit faculty may amend the unit's reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair/Director, Dean, and Provost, to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to QRFs in years one through six during existing multiple

year terms of annually renewable contracts unless requested in writing by the QRF prior to the initiation of the review process. The Dean and Provost (or their designees) shall work collaboratively with the unit faculty and the Chair/Director during the policy revision process. (Article 14, Section 6.2.2.3)

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

B. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of QRF in Years One through Six (Article 14, Section 6.2.3)

1. APRs shall be conducted by the Chair/Director, in accordance with the unit's reappointment policy. Any involvement of unit faculty in the annual reappointment process can be found in the Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The unit's written recommendation, as prepared by the Chair/Director, shall be submitted to the Dean.
3. Prior to submitting the written recommendation to the Dean, the Chair/Director shall meet with the QRF, provide a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the recommendation. In response, the QRF may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days.
4. The unit's written recommendation regarding reappointment shall be submitted to the Dean. The decision regarding reappointment shall be in accordance with the provisions of Article 14, Section 3.2 of the CBA.

C. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of QRF in Years One through Six (Article 14, Section 6.2.4)

1. QRF BUFMs who have received appointments for three (3) consecutive years shall be subject to an Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) during the third year of appointment before an additional appointment can be authorized.
2. Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the QRF compile a dossier consisting of a curriculum vitae (CV) and additional materials required by the unit's reappointment policy. A description of the additional materials expected for EPRs can be found in the Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.
3. Initial responsibility for applying established criteria and standards of the unit's reappointment policy and making recommendations regarding reappointment following an EPR rests with the tenured and QRF in the unit who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, who shall make a written recommendation to the

Chair/Director. No eligible voter shall vote in more than one level of review. If eligible voters have the opportunity to vote at more than one level, they shall vote only at the unit level on candidates from their unit.

4. The Chair/Director shall submit the written recommendations of the unit faculty to the Dean, accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Chair/Director disagrees with the recommendation of the unit faculty, then the reasons for the disagreement; a copy of the Chair's/Director's letter must be provided to the unit faculty.
5. Prior to submitting the unit's recommendation to the Dean, the Chair/Director shall meet with the QRF, provide written copies of the recommendations from the unit faculty and the Chair/Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the QRF may submit a rebuttal letter in accordance with the unit's QRF reappointment policy, within 3 business days.
6. The Dean of the college shall make an independent recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the academic unit, the Chair/Director, and the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward all of these recommendations to the Provost. Upon the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the QRF may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days. (Article 14, Section 6.2.2.1)
7. The Provost shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or non-renewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost.
8. The decision to reappoint the faculty member, upon the completion of the Enhanced Performance Review, shall be in accordance with the provisions of Article 14, Section 3.2.
9. If, after considering the recommendations regarding reappointment from the academic unit, the Chair/Director, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost determines that a QRF is not performing satisfactorily, the University shall give written notice of its intention to non-renew the employment of the affected BUFM and the reasons for the decision to non-renew shall be specified, with a copy sent to the BGSU- FA.

#### D. Evaluation of QRF in Years Seven and Beyond

In place of APRs and EPRs, the annual merit review process shall serve as the annual evaluation for QRF in years seven and beyond. Annual evaluation ratings higher than unacceptable in all assigned areas, based on a BUFM's allocation of effort, shall indicate a successful annual evaluation. Each unit shall determine the standard for an "unacceptable" rating in its merit document (Article 14, Section 6.3.1). Annual evaluation ratings indicating an unacceptable score in any assigned area based on allocation of effort (e.g.,

teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, and/or service) shall be indicative of an unsuccessful annual evaluation. An unsuccessful annual evaluation shall result in an “extraordinary review” by the Chair/Director with the approval of the Dean (Article 14, Section 6.3.2).

### **Promotion Process: QRF**

#### A. Eligibility

Promotion in rank is based upon performance. A QRF may request an evaluation for promotion based upon: (a) the criteria for such rank (Article 14, Section 2.0), (b) academic unit policies, and (c) the academic achievements of the QRF.

A QRF-Assistant Professor may apply, during the individual’s sixth year of full-time employment as a faculty member, for promotion to QRF-Associate Professor. However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, a BUFM, at the discretion of the Administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to six (6) years.

A QRF-Associate Professor may apply, during the individual’s sixth year of fulltime employment as a QRF-Associate Professor, for promotion to QRF-Professor. However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, a BUFM, at the discretion of the Administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to six (6) years. One piece of information that might be important to consider is that historically there have been QRF who did not have a path to promotion (i.e., it is possible that a QRF-Associate Professor might not be in the sixth year in rank, but had many years of service as a QRF-Assistant Professor and no ability to seek promotion).

#### B. Policy Development

Each academic unit (department/school or instructional support unit) shall have established written policies for promotion of QRF regarding: (a) the criteria and standards used for evaluation, (b) the process for conducting and completing the evaluation for promotion, (c) the schedule or deadlines necessary for completing the evaluation and, (d) a process outlining the opportunity for BUFMs to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Sections 5.1, 6.4.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing unit-specific criteria, standards and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the BUFMs of the academic unit and the Chair/Director, subject to endorsement of the Dean and Provost. (Article 14, Section 5.4.2.2)

A description of the criteria and standards used for promotion and academic unit procedures for creation and submission of promotion materials can be found in each

Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.

At the initiation of the University or unit faculty, the unit faculty may amend the unit's QRF promotion policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair/Director, Dean, and Provost to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, changes in the criteria for promotion may not be applied retroactively to QRF during existing multiple year terms of annually renewable contracts unless requested in writing by the QRF prior to the initiation of the review process. QRF in years 7 and beyond shall automatically retain the original promotion criteria and standards for a three-year period before the new criteria and standards for promotion are applied unless requested in writing by the QRF prior to the initiation of the review process. The Dean and Provost (or their designees) shall work collaboratively with the unit faculty and the Chair/Director during the policy revision process. (Article 14, Section 6.4.2.3).

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

#### C. Process for Evaluation of QRF Promotion Request (Article 14, Section 6.4.3)

1. A request by a QRF for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit
  - a. The academic unit's eligible voters for a QRF applying for promotion shall consist of all tenured BUFMs in the unit and all QRF of higher rank in the unit.
  - b. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint BGSU BUFMs holding rank higher than the applicant for promotion, from related disciplines outside the Department/School, with the consent of the unit's voting eligible faculty and the Chair/Director. Such appointments will be made so as to maintain the integrity of the discipline.
  - c. In academic units with no QRF of higher rank, the Dean of the college shall appoint one or more eligible QRF from related disciplines outside the unit, with the consent of the unit's voting eligible faculty and the Chair/Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
2. Promotion Reviews shall require that the QRF compile a dossier consisting of a curriculum vitae (CV) and additional materials required by the unit's promotion policy. A description of the additional materials expected for promotion can be found in the Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.
3. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and standards and making recommendations regarding promotion rests with the academic unit's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Chair/Director. No eligible voter shall vote in more than one level of review. If eligible voters have the opportunity to vote at

more than one level of review, they shall vote only at the unit level on candidates from their unit.

4. The Chair/Director shall submit to the Dean the written recommendation of the academic unit's eligible voters accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Chair/Director disagrees with the unit's recommendation, the reasons for disagreement shall be stated in writing, and a copy of the Chair/Director's letter shall be provided to the unit faculty.
5. Prior to submitting the unit's recommendation to the Dean, the Chair/Director shall meet with the QRF, provide copies of the written recommendations from the unit faculty and the Chair/Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the QRF may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days.
6. The Dean of the college shall make an independent recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the academic unit, the Chair/Director, and the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward all of these recommendations to the Provost. Upon the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the QRF may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days (Article 14, Section 6.4.2.1)
7. The Provost shall have the responsibility for recommending promotion to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost.
8. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the faculty member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. The faculty member has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing the Chair/Director, Dean, and Provost, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has exercised the right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for promotion.
9. An affirmative vote of a majority of the academic unit's eligible voters (as defined in Article 14, Section 6.4.3.1) shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. BUFMs eligible to vote have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote, except in the three cases that follow. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leave (FIL) or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote. Consistent with University policies on conflict of interest (e.g., Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy, Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy), eligible voters shall recuse themselves from participating and/or voting in decisions involving individuals with whom they have a conflict of interest. Such abstention shall not be counted as a negative vote. With the approval of the Dean,



an eligible voter may request recusal from participating based on documented extenuating circumstances. Failure to vote due to an approved recusal shall not be counted as a negative vote.

### **Reappointment Process: TTF**

#### A. Policy Development

Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed annually in the form of either an annual performance review (APR) or for reappointment in an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with the academic unit's reappointment policy. At the unit-level, the decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of current and previous annual performance reviews (APRs) and/or enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), with emphasis on satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion (if applicable). (Article 14, Section 7.2.1)

Each academic unit (department/school or instructional support unit) shall have established written policies for reappointment of probationary faculty members regarding: (a) the criteria and standards used for annual performance reviews (APRs) and enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), (b) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (c) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews and, (d) a process outlining the opportunity for BUFMs to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. (Article 14, Sections 5.1, 7.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing unit-specific criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty members lies with the tenured and tenure-track BUFMs of the academic unit and the Chair/Director, subject to the endorsement of the Dean and Provost. (Article 14, Section 7.2.2.2)

A description of the criteria and standards used for APRs and EPRs and academic unit procedures for the creation and submission of APR and EPR materials can be found in each Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.

At the initiation of the University or unit faculty, the unit faculty may amend the unit's reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair/Director, Dean, and Provost. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to probationary tenure-track faculty during their probationary period unless requested in writing by the faculty member prior to the initiation of the review process. The Dean and Provost (or their designees) shall work collaboratively with the unit faculty and the Chair/Director during the policy revision process. (Article 14, Section 7.2.2.3)

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

A. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of TTF (Article 14, Section 7.2.3)

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Chair/Director, in accordance with the unit's reappointment policy. Any involvement of unit faculty in the annual reappointment process can be found in the Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, and service. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The review shall be submitted in writing to the Dean and to the Provost. Included in the review shall be a statement indicating whether sufficient progress is being made toward tenure and/or promotion.
3. Prior to submitting the unit's written recommendation to the Dean, the Chair/Director shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the unit's recommendation. In response, the probationary tenure track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days.

B. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of TTF (Article 14, Section 7.2.4)

1. Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be given an enhanced performance review at the mid-point of their probationary period. The mid-probationary enhanced performance review shall normally occur during the third year of a probationary appointment. However, in cases where a faculty member has received prior service credit (see Article 14, Section 3.1.1.6 of the CBA), the review shall occur at a time agreed upon by the appointee and the Provost.
2. Mid-probationary enhanced performance reviews shall be conducted by the tenured BUFMs of the academic unit. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, and service. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. The unit faculty's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the Chair/ Director.
3. The Chair/ Director shall submit the recommendation of the unit faculty to the Dean accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation. If the Chair/Director disagrees with the unit faculty's recommendation, the reasons for disagreement shall be stated in writing and a copy of the Chair's/Director's letter must be provided to the unit faculty.
4. Prior to submitting the Department's/School's recommendation to the Dean, the Chair/Director shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide

copies of the written recommendations from the unit faculty and the Chair/Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days. (Article 14, Section 7.2.2.1)

5. The Dean of the college shall make an independent recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the academic unit, the Chair/Director, and the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward all of these recommendations to the Provost. Upon the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days.
6. The Provost shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or non-renewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost.
7. If, after considering the recommendations regarding reappointment from the academic unit faculty, the Chair/Director, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost determines that a probationary tenure-track faculty member is not making reasonable progress toward tenure, the University shall give written notice of its intention to non-renew the employment of the affected probationary tenure-track BUFM, and a copy of the notification is sent to the BGSU-FA.
8. A probationary tenure-track BUFM who fails to obtain a recommendation for reappointment at the end of the mid-probationary review shall receive a one (1) year terminal appointment at the end of which time, the BUFM shall be terminated from employment at BGSU.

### **Tenure and Promotion Process: TTF**

#### A. Policy Development

Each academic unit (department/school, or instructional support unit) shall have written policies for tenure and promotion for TTF members, regarding: (a) the criteria and standards used for tenure and promotion, (b) the process for conducting and completing tenure and promotion reviews, (c) the schedule or deadlines for completing tenure and promotion reviews, and (d) a process outlining the opportunity for BUFMs to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Sections 5.1, 7.5.1)

A description of the criteria and standards used for tenure and promotion and academic unit procedures for the creation and submission of tenure and promotion materials can

be found in each Department's/School's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.

At the initiation of the University or unit faculty, the unit faculty may amend the unit's TTF promotion policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair/Director, Dean, and Provost. Changes in the criteria and standards for promotion may not be applied retroactively to TTF members unless requested in writing by the TTF member prior to the initiation of the review process. The Dean and Provost (or their designees) shall work collaboratively with the unit faculty and the Chair/Director during the policy revision process. (Article 14, Section 7.4.3)

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

- B. Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Recommendations (Article 14, Section 7.5)
1. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion rests with the academic unit's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Chair/Director. No eligible voter shall vote in more than one level of review. If eligible voters have the opportunity to vote at more than one level, they shall vote only at the unit level on candidates from their unit.
  2. The Chair/Director shall submit the recommendation of the tenured BUFM's of the academic unit and a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation to the Dean. If the recommendation of the Chair/Director differs from that of the academic unit's tenured BUFMs, this recommendation of the Chair/Director shall state the reasons for the difference. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Dean. In response, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days.
  3. The Dean of the college shall make an independent recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of academic unit, the Chair/Director, and the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward all of these recommendations to the Provost. Upon to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 3 business days. (Article 14, Section 7.5.1)
  4. The Provost shall have the responsibility for recommending approval or disapproval to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost.
  5. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the TTF member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. Except for the tenure and promotion to Associate Professor evaluation occurring during the last year of the probationary appointment, the candidate has the right to

withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing the Chair/Director, Dean and Provost, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for tenure and/or promotion.

C. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Article 14, Section 7.6)

1. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section B above.
2. Probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall be advised of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made and shall be given the opportunity to submit material that they believe to be pertinent to a decision.
3. Probationary tenure-track faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the period of probationary service, and denial of an early application for tenure shall have no effect on subsequent applications for tenure within the probationary period.
4. A probationary tenure-track faculty member in the last year of probationary appointment, or who applies for tenure and promotion at an earlier date, shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit (Article 14, Section 7.6.5), and there a single vote of recommendation for or against tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall be made.
5. The academic unit's eligible voters shall consist of those BUFMs who are tenured and are at or above the rank of Associate Professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint tenured BUFMs from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair/Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
6. An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure and promotion to Associate Professor be granted. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor during the probationary period requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of all eligible voters in the academic unit because such action constitutes immediate tenure. Tenured BUFMs at or above the rank of Associate Professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote, except in the three cases that follow. Eligible voters on FIL or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote shall not be counted as a negative vote. Consistent with University policies on conflict of interest (e.g., Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy, Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy), eligible voters shall recuse themselves from participating and/or voting in decisions involving individuals with whom they

have a conflict of interest. Such abstention shall not be counted as a negative vote. With the approval of the Dean, an eligible voter may request recusal from participating based on documented extenuating circumstances. Failure to vote due to an approved recusal shall not be counted as a negative vote.

7. Assistant Professors may not be tenured without promotion. In those rare cases prior to collective bargaining where the BUFM is a tenured Assistant Professor, the faculty member shall apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor independently of an application for tenure. In such cases, an affirmative vote of a majority of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote, except in the three cases that follow. Eligible voters on FIL or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote shall not be counted as a negative vote. Consistent with University policies on conflict of interest (e.g., Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy, Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy), eligible voters shall recuse themselves from participating and/or voting in decisions involving individuals with whom they have a conflict of interest. Such abstention shall not be counted as a negative vote. With the approval of the Dean, an eligible voter may request recusal from participating based on documented extenuating circumstances. Failure to vote due to an approved recusal shall not be counted as a negative vote.
8. In cases where the BUFM begins employment at BGSU as an Associate Professor without tenure, the faculty member may apply for tenure independently of an application for promotion. In such cases, an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote, except in the three cases that follow. Eligible voters on FIL or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote shall not be counted as a negative vote. Consistent with University policies on conflict of interest (e.g., Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy, Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy), eligible voters shall recuse themselves from participating and/or voting in decisions involving individuals with whom they have a conflict of interest. Such abstention shall not be counted as a negative vote. With the approval of the Dean, an eligible voter may request recusal from participating based on documented extenuating circumstances. Failure to vote due to an approved recusal shall not be counted as a negative vote.

#### D. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor (Article 14, Section 7.7)

1. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section B above.
2. A tenure-track or tenured BUFM who applies for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit.

3. The academic unit's eligible voters for candidates applying for promotion to Professor shall consist of tenured BUFMs who are at the rank of Professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean shall appoint tenured BGSU BUFMs holding the rank of Professor from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair/Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
4. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Tenured BUFMs at the rank of Professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion to Professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote, except in the three cases that follow. Eligible voters on FIL or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote shall not be counted as a negative vote. Consistent with University policies on conflict of interest (e.g., Consensual Amorous Relationships Policy, Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy), eligible voters shall recuse themselves from participating and/or voting in decisions involving individuals with whom they have a conflict of interest. Such abstention shall not be counted as a negative vote. With the approval of the Dean, an eligible voter may request recusal from participating based on documented extenuating circumstances. Failure to vote due to an approved recusal shall not be counted as a negative vote.

Updated to comply with CBA #3 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022)  
Approved February 6, 2020 by Provost and President of BGSU-FA  
Revised May 16, 2022