Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS, LEADERSHIP & POLICY

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

A. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) of NTTF include teaching and service, as outlined in the sections below.

As a school with faculty representing multiple disciplines, expected standards of activity and outcomes vary. For example, service opportunities in some disciplines may be more limited than in others.

Annual Performance Review (APR) and Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) are the primary means for ensuring that a NTTF is performing well; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady and consistent with the criteria and standards for reappointment and promotion outlined below.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

Although 80% teaching and 20% service are the customary expectations for NTTF positions, it is also possible than an NTTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio. An NTTF allocation that includes scholarship is very rare and is made only with approval of the Dean.

Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, special projects, or leaves granted by the CBA needs to be specified and approved in writing by the Dean.

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 actual distribution of workload.

For EPRs, any concerns expressed in the previous reviews should be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period should be demonstrated.

1. Teaching

   Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Domains used in the

evaluation of teaching include teaching and instructional development. 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. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

a. a compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
b. quantitative student evaluations of teaching equivalent to an average at or above 3.0 on a 5-point scale for all courses taught during the review period, including academic year and summer semesters;
c. generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student comments on qualitative student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the review period, including academic year and summer semesters;
d. documentation of a formal classroom peer observation conducted by another faculty member or faculty administrator (recommended one conducted annually and by a faculty member or faculty administrator above rank), which is deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns); and
e. other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to a combination of the following:
    i. course syllabi and other course materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction, improvements or amendments made on the basis of teaching evaluations, and range of courses taught;
    ii. the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses;
    iii. independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students;
    iv. teaching awards and distinctions;
    v. quality academic advising provided to students;
        - School faculty support EFLP programs in a variety of ways and in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership.
    vi. membership or leadership on dissertation and/or thesis committees;
    vii. membership or leadership on completed honors project committee
    viii. conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and
    ix. effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning

2. Service

Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking reappointment through APRs and EPRs shall provide evidence of appropriate and effective service to the University community. The school defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Beginning in the first year, NTTF faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Service Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their service. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of service. Reviewers base faculty evaluations on professional judgment of performance focusing on professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, directors, and others.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of service include:

a. narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages), consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier that addresses how the candidate performs these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and
b. artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For APRs, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus combination of at least two the following; for EPRs, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus a combination of at least four the following, with an average of at least two per year under review:
    i. leadership role (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, professional committees/associations;
    ii. participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
    iii. advising of student organizations;
    iv. unpaid consultations;
    v. performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
    vi. membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
    vii. community awards and other recognitions;

viii. written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
ix. service and professional recognitions; and
x. or the equivalent

Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define their total contributions in teaching and service.

B. <u>Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials</u>

1. APRs and EPRs shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following:
    a. Current curriculum vitae (CV) in approved BGSU format.
    b. Teaching artifacts:
        i. a narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
        ii. quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching all courses taught during the academic year(s) under review (submission of quantitative and qualitative evaluations for summer courses taught is optional);
        iii. documentation of formal classroom observations for the period under review (for EPRs, include peer evaluations that were included in previous APRs);
        iv. other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching (e.g., course syllabi, teaching awards, etc.; see above section 3.e. under Criteria).
    c. Service artifacts:
        i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages), consisting of a statement of service philosophy and activities and an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier that addresses how the candidate performed these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner;
        ii. a table of service activities; and
    d. For EPRs, annual review letters from the years under review should also be included.

2. The dossier is prepared by the individual faculty candidate according to School, College, and University guidelines.
3. Faculty shall submit materials to the EFLP Director on or before the date specified by the EFLP Director and in accordance with the University's schedule. The Director shall review each set of credentials for completeness.

All materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.

C. Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

1. The Annual Performance Review (APR) Committee
    a. Upon the candidate's submission and the Director's review of the APR portfolio, these materials will be placed in a central location to be reviewed by the APR Committee. In addition, other EFLP tenured/tenure-track faculty and NTTF above the rank of the candidate under review will have an opportunity to review materials and make recommendations to the APR Committee.
    b. For the purpose of APR, the APR Committee shall consist of four members: the EFLP Director, the candidate's Program/Area Coordinator, the candidate's mentor, and at least one other tenured tenured/tenure-track faculty member or NTTF above the rank of the candidate under review from the school, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the EFLP Director.
    c. An announcement will be made by the EFLP Director, in accordance with the guidelines of the university's notification schedule for contract decisions, to all EFLP tenured/tenure-track faculty and NTTF above the rank of the candidate under review, indicating where the materials are located. Committee members and other school faculty who meet the requirements mentioned above must have at least one week to review the materials.
    d. Following the stated review period, the EFLP Director will call a meeting of the APR Committee for the purpose of collecting a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate under review.
    e. The EFLP Director will write a recommendation on the basis of the discussion with the APR Committee. Prior to its submission to the EDHD Dean, the EFLP Director shall circulate a draft memo to the members of the APR Committee to assure that it reflects the majority view of the faculty.

D. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

Criteria for NTTF Promotion Review include teaching and service, as outlined in the sections below.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

Although 80% teaching and 20% service are the customary expectations for NTTF positions, it is also possible than an NTTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio. An NTTF allocation that includes scholarship is very rare and is made only with approval of the Dean.

Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, special projects, or leaves granted by the CBA needs to be specified and approved in writing by the Dean.

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 actual distribution of workload.

Although a faculty member's role may emphasize one domain over another, achievement in one domain shall not substitute for lack of achievement in another required domain. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define the candidate's total contribution in teaching and service.

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

    a. Shall have a minimum of a master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment.

    b. 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. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching and instructional development. 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. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

        Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

        i. Teaching: Given the school's involvement in degree programs and general education, it considers high quality instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. As described below, required performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching include a narrative, quantitative teaching evaluations, and peer evaluations. Submission of qualitative teaching evaluations is optional.
            - A compelling narrative that demonstrates success in teaching (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
            - Quantitative results of student evaluations of all courses taught in the years under review (typically the last six years) (evaluations for all of teaching load in each academic year, plus all courses taught in the summers during those years)
                - Aggregate scores from student evaluations of teaching should typically be at or above 3.2 on a 5-point scale

    - Improvement in quantitative student evaluations of teaching over the years under review will also be valued
    - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
  - Qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
    - Candidates who submit qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may submit a sample of such evaluations to demonstrate effective teaching, reflection, and growth; however, for every course section submitted, *all* qualitative comments from that section must be submitted
    - Qualitative comments should be generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns);
    - If the candidate chooses to submit qualitative evaluations, the teaching narrative should include how the candidate addressed relevant qualitative comments from past semesters;
  - All written evaluations from observations of classroom teaching conducted by other faculty members or faculty administrators within the years under review (typically the last six years, recommended one conducted annually), which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns)
    - Peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and/or reflect teaching excellence during the period under review

ii. Instructional Development: Non-tenure track faculty members in EFLP are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. The non-tenure track faculty member seeking promotion must provide a narrative and documentation that includes the following. Some of these items could be included multiple times (e.g., refinement … for 2 different courses):
  - Course syllabi and other materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
    - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
    - Evidence of improvements or amendments made on the basis of student and peer evaluations of teaching is valued
  - Effective implementation of innovative instructional techniques (e.g., use of technology and other resources to promote active student learning)
  - Refinement, modification, and improvement of existing courses
  - Successful creation of a new course
  - Contribution to curriculum or program development
  - Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills

iii. Other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching may be included in the dossier, including but not limited to a combination of the following:
  - Quality academic advising provided to students

- School faculty support EFLP programs in a variety of ways and in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership.
- Membership or leadership on dissertation and/or thesis committees
- Membership or leadership on completed honors project committees
- Independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students
- Teaching awards and distinctions

iv. In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the school consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to the candidate's specific case if it helps to better define their total contributions in teaching and service.

c. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness. Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking promotion from Instructor to Lecturer shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community, and should demonstrate a continuous record of service involvement and emerging leadership at the school, college, university, and professional levels. The School defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of service include:

i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier that addresses how the candidate performed these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and

ii. Artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For promotion to Lecturer, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus a combination of at least four the following, with an average of at least two per year under review:
   - leadership role (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, professional committees/associations;
   - participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
   - advising of student organizations;
   - unpaid consultations;

- performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
- membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
- community awards and other recognitions;
- written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
- service and professional recognitions; and
- or the equivalent

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness and sustained service contributions within and external to BGSU. The following criteria shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching and service for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer:

a. Shall have a minimum of a master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment.

b. 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. Successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have an ongoing, established reputation as excellent, effective teachers. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching and instructional development. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

i. Teaching: Given the school's involvement in degree programs and general education, it considers high quality instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. As described below, required performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching include a narrative, quantitative teaching evaluations, and peer evaluations. Submission of qualitative teaching evaluations is optional.

- A compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in

previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;

- Quantitative results of student evaluations of all courses taught in the years under review (typically the last six years) (evaluations for all of teaching load in each academic year, plus all courses taught in the summers during those years)
  - Aggregate scores from student evaluations of teaching should typically be at or above 3.5 on a 5-point scale
  - Improvement in quantitative student evaluations of teaching over the years under review will also be valued
  - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
- Qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
  - Candidates who submit qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may submit a sample of such evaluations to demonstrate excellence in teaching, reflection, and growth; however, for every course section submitted, *all* qualitative comments from that section must be submitted
  - Qualitative comments should be positive and demonstrate teaching excellence;
  - If the candidate chooses to submit qualitative evaluations, the teaching narrative should include how the candidate addressed relevant qualitative comments from past semesters;
- All written evaluations from observations of classroom teaching conducted by other faculty members or faculty administrators within the years under review (typically the last six years, recommended one conducted annually), which demonstrate teaching excellence during the period under review.

ii. Instructional Development: Non-tenure track faculty members in EFLP are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. The non-tenure track faculty member seeking promotion must provide a narrative and documentation that includes some or all of the following. Particular value will be placed on contribution to program curriculum and leadership. Some of these items could be included multiple times (e.g., refinement … for 2 different courses):

- Course syllabi and other materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
  - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
  - Evidence of improvements or amendments made on the basis of student and peer evaluations of teaching is valued
- Effective implementation innovative instructional techniques (e.g., use of technology and other resources to promote active student learning)
- Refinement, modification, and improvement of existing courses
- Successful creation of a new course
- Contribution to curriculum or program development

- Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills

iii. Other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to a combination of the following:
- Quality academic advising provided to students
  - School faculty support EFLP programs in a variety of ways and in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership.
- Membership or leadership on dissertation and/or thesis committees
- Membership or leadership on completed honors project committees
- Independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students
- Teaching awards and distinctions

iv. In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the school consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to the candidate's specific case, including scholarly and creative activity.

c. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness. Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community, and should demonstrate significant and successful leadership roles in a continuous record of service involvement. The School defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of service include:

i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier that addresses how the candidate performed these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and

ii. Artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For promotion to Senior Lecturer, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative; evidence of leadership (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, and/or professional committees/associations; plus a combination of at least four the following, with an average of at least two per year since promotion to Lecturer:
- participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
- advising of student organizations;

- unpaid consultations;
- performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
- membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
- community awards and other recognitions;
- written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
- service and professional recognitions; and
- or the equivalent

B. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

1. A candidate for promotion must notify the School Director that he or she is a candidate for promotion (in accordance with the CBA and other University guidelines).
2. Candidates will submit portfolios to the School Director on or before a date specified by the School Director, in accordance with University guidelines. The candidate is encouraged to seek assistance in preparing the portfolio from his or her mentor and other faculty prior to submission to the Director.
3. The School Director will review each set of credentials for completeness. Portfolios will be made available to the unit's eligible voters.
4. Portfolios should include at least the following:
    a. Application Cover Sheet for Promotion and Tenure Review.
    b. EFLP's Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion document.
    c. EPR letters from all levels of review.
    d. APR letters.
    e. A current curriculum vitae in approved BGSU format.
    f. Narratives for each of the areas of review: teaching and service.
    g. Artifacts taken from the areas of teaching and service.

C. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) of TTF include teaching; research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service, as outlined in the sections below.

As a school with faculty representing multiple disciplines, expected standards of activity and outcomes vary. For example, service opportunities in some disciplines may be more limited than in others.

The Annual Performance Review (APR) and Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) are the primary means for ensuring that a probationary TTF is making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady over the entire probationary

period and consistent with the criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion outlined below.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

Although there are customary teaching, research/scholarship, and service allocations for TTF in EFLP, it is also possible than a TTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities special projects, or leaves granted by the CBA needs to be specified and approved in writing by the Dean.

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 actual distribution of workload.

For EPRs, any concerns expressed in the previous reviews should be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period should be demonstrated.

1. Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews.

    a. Teaching

    Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching and instructional development. 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. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

    Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

    a. a compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
    b. quantitative student evaluations of teaching equivalent to an average at or above 3.0 on a 5-point scale for all courses taught during the review period, including academic year and summer semesters;

c. generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student comments on qualitative student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the review period, including academic year and summer semesters;
d. documentation of a formal classroom peer observation conducted by another faculty member or faculty administrator (recommended one conducted annually and by a faculty member or faculty administrator above rank), which is deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns); and
e. other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to a combination of the following:
    - course syllabi and other course materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction, improvements or amendments made on the basis of teaching evaluations, and range of courses taught;
    - the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses;
    - independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students;
    - teaching awards and distinctions;
    - quality academic advising provided to students;
        - School faculty support EFLP programs in a variety of ways and in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership.
    - membership or leadership on dissertation and/or thesis committees;
    - membership or leadership on completed honors project committee
    - conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills;
    - effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning; and

b. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is the ongoing responsibility of all tenured and tenure-track 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 School's evaluation of faculty members who are on the tenure track. Domains used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include publications, presentations, and performances; internal and external research/scholarship funding; editorships; research awards and honors; and reputation within the candidate's field.

Beginning in the first year of appointment, tenure-track faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Research Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their research,

scholarship, and/or creative activity. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of these activities.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include:

i. a compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a statement of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity philosophy, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity agenda and accomplishments, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns (if any) expressed in previous reviews have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;

ii. artifacts of research, scholarship, and creative activity that demonstrate productivity and progress toward tenure:

(1) Publications, presentations, and other scholarship activity. Publications, presentations, and performances are major products of any research/ scholarship and, thus, central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are very significant. So, too, are the publication of books, book chapters, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Although not expected at APRs, journal editorships and associate editorships of peer-reviewed journals and other publications are noteworthy, as well.

- Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline.
- Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.
- Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with where faculty members are in the probationary period. Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. To demonstrate progress toward tenure, the expectation would be, at minimum, to have at least one refereed journal article (or equivalent) published or in press per year. For APRs in advance of EPR (mid-probationary review), evidence of publication submissions under review will be considered and valued.
- The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work.
- Documented in press publications are considered published.
- Faculty shall have an average of at least one national or international peer reviewed presentation (or equivalent; e.g., regional or state

presentation; invited presentation) at a professional conference each year.

- In the CV and/or the narrative, faculty in EFLP should indicate the acceptance rate and impact factors for articles published, the agency responsible for the publication, and the intended audience of the publication.

(2) Internal and External Grants. In addition to supporting research, securing internal and external support is an important external validation of the quality of research and scholarship activity. While no specific quantity of research grant support is required for reappointment, School expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the candidate's field. Performance indicators include number of grant applications submitted, agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal, significance and scope of the projects, research funds awarded, performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects, and conversion of the results of grant-funded projects into peer-reviewed presentations and publications.

(3) Additional Considerations.

- Research awards and honors.
- Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship.
- Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required.
- In their research/scholarship narrative, faculty members shall explain they have met stated criteria and how the performance indicators (i.e. artifacts) illustrate how they have made significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline.

iii. Developing Reputation within the Candidate's Field. One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/scholarship is his/her reputation within the candidate's field. In the case of APR, TTF should provide evidence (if available) in the narrative and/or the artifacts of developing reputation in the candidate's field (e.g., citations to research, honors and awards, impact factors for publications, invited presentations).

c. Service

Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty submitting APR materials shall provide evidence of appropriate and effective service to the University community. The school defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's

professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Beginning in the first year, TTF faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Service Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their service. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of service. Reviewers base faculty evaluations on professional judgment of performance focusing on professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, directors, and others.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of service include:

a. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages), consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in your dossier that addresses how you perform these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and
b. artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For APRs, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus a combination of at least two of the following:
    - leadership role (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, professional committees/associations;
    - participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
    - advising of student organizations;
    - unpaid consultations;
    - performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
    - membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
    - scholarly journal editorial review board membership and/or manuscript review;
    - community awards and other recognitions;
    - written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
    - service and professional recognitions; and
    - or the equivalent

2. Criteria for Enhanced Performance Reviews.

a. Teaching

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the university. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching and instructional development. 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. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

i. a compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching during the EPR review period (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
ii. quantitative student evaluations of teaching equivalent to an average at or above 3.0 on a 5-point scale for all courses taught during the review period, including academic years and summer semesters;
iii. generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student comments on qualitative student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the review period, including academic years and summer semesters;
iv. documentation of a formal classroom peer observation conducted by another faculty member or faculty administrator (recommended one conducted annually and by a faculty member or faculty administrator above rank), which is deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns); and
v. other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching, including but not limited to a combination of the following:
    - course syllabi and other course materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction, improvements or amendments made on the basis of teaching evaluations, and range of courses taught;
    - the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses;
    - independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students;
    - teaching awards and distinctions;
    - quality academic advising provided to students;
        - School faculty support EFLP programs in a variety of ways and in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership.

- membership or leadership on dissertation and/or thesis committees;
- membership or leadership on completed honors project committee
- conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills;
- effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning; and

b. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a responsibility of all tenured and tenure-track 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 School's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment. Domains used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include publications, presentations, and performances; internal and external research/scholarship funding; editorships; research awards and honors; and reputation within the candidate's field.

Beginning in the first year of appointment, tenure-track faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Research Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of these activities.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include:

i. a compelling narrative that demonstrates successful progress in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a statement of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity philosophy, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity agenda and accomplishments, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns (if any) expressed in previous reviews have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
ii. artifacts of research, scholarship, and creative activity that demonstrate productivity and progress toward tenure:

(1) <u>Publications, presentations, and other scholarship activity</u>. Publications, presentations, and performances are major products of any research/ scholarship and, thus, central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are very significant. So, too, are the publication of books, book chapters, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Although not expected at EPR, journal editorships and associate editorships of peer-reviewed journals and other publications are noteworthy, as well.

- Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline.
- Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.
- Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with where faculty members are in the probationary period. Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. Thus, the expectation at EPR would be, at minimum, to have at least one refereed journal article (or equivalent) in press and another under review. For EPRs, evidence of publication submissions will be considered and valued, as well. Candidates at EPR shall also demonstrate steady progress and productivity in publication submissions.
- The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work.
- Documented in press publications are considered published.
- Faculty shall have an average of at least one national or international peer reviewed presentation (or equivalent; e.g., regional or state presentation; invited presentation) at a professional conference each year.
- In the CV and/or the narrative, faculty in EFLP should indicate the acceptance rate and impact factors for articles published, the agency responsible for the publication, and the intended audience of the publication.

(2) Internal and External Grants. In addition to supporting research, securing internal and external support is an important external validation of the quality of research and scholarship activity. While no specific quantity of research grant support is required for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit, School expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. Performance indicators include number of grant applications submitted, agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal, significance and scope of the projects, research funds awarded, performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects, and conversion of the results of grant-funded projects into peer-reviewed presentations and publications. One (1) external grant award of more than $15,000 may be substituted for a journal article at EPR.

(3) Additional Considerations.

- Research awards and honors.
- Participation in institutionally initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship

and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship.

- Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required.
- In their research/scholarship narrative, faculty members shall explain they have met stated criteria and how the performance indicators (i.e. artifacts) illustrate how they have made significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline.

iii. Reputation within the Candidate's Field. One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/scholarship is his/her reputation within the candidate's field. In the case of EPR, TTF should provide evidence in the narrative and/or the artifacts of developing reputation in the candidate's field (e.g., citations to research, honors and awards, impact factors for publications, invited presentations).

c. Service

Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty submitting EPR materials shall provide evidence of appropriate and effective service to the University community. The school defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Beginning in the first year, TTF faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Service Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their service. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of service. Reviewers base faculty evaluations on professional judgment of performance focusing on professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, directors, and others.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of service include:

i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages), consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in your dossier that addresses how you perform these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and
ii. artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For EPRs, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus a combination of at least four of the following, with an average of at least two per year during the period under review:

- leadership role (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, professional committees/associations;
- participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
- advising of student organizations;
- unpaid consultations;
- performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
- membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
- scholarly journal editorial review board membership and/or manuscript review;
- community awards and other recognitions;
- written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
- service and professional recognitions; and
- or the equivalent

d. For EPRs, annual review letters from the years under review should also be included in the dossier.

D. <u>Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials</u>

1. APRs and EPRs shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following:
   a. Current curriculum vitae (CV) in approved BGSU format.
   b. Teaching artifacts:
      i. a narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
      ii. quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the academic year(s) under review (submission of quantitative and qualitative evaluations for summer courses taught is optional);
      iii. documentation of formal classroom observations for the period under review (for EPRs, include peer evaluations that were included in previous APRs);
      iv. other artifacts that demonstrate effective teaching (e.g., course syllabi, teaching awards, etc.; see above section 3.a.v under Criteria).

c. Research review should include the following:
   i. a narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of a (1) statement of research philosophy, (2) research agenda, (3) research accomplishments, (4) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (5) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
   ii. artifacts of scholarly productivity (e.g., published articles, presentations, research grants, etc.) that demonstrate progress toward tenure:
d. Service artifacts:
   i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages), consisting of a statement of your commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in your dossier that addresses how you perform these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner;
   ii. a table of service activities; and
e. For EPRs, annual review letters from the years under review should also be included.

2. The dossier is prepared by the individual faculty candidate according to School, College, and University guidelines.
3. Faculty shall submit materials to the EFLP Director on or before the date specified by the EFLP Director and in accordance with the University's schedule. The Director shall review each set of credentials for completeness.

All materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors.

E. <u>Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process</u>

1. Review and Evaluation of APR Materials
   a. Upon the candidate's submission and the Director's review of the APR portfolio, these materials will be placed in a central location to be reviewed by the APR Committee. In addition, other tenured faculty in EFLP will have an opportunity to review materials and make recommendations to the APR Committee.
   b. For the purpose of the APR, the APR Committee shall consist of four members: the EFLP Director, the candidate's Program/Area Coordinator, the candidate's mentor, and at least one other tenured faculty member from the School, chosen by the candidate in consultation with the EFLP Director.
   c. An announcement will be made by the EFLP Director, in accordance with the guidelines of the university's notification schedule for contract decisions, to all EFLP tenured faculty, indicating where the materials are located. Committee members and other tenured faculty must have at least one week to review the materials.
   d. Following the stated review period, the EFLP Director will call the meeting of the APR Committee for the purpose of writing a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate under review.
   e. The EFLP Director will write a memo that addresses whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure on the basis of the discussion with the APR Committee. Prior to its submission to the EDHD Dean, the EFLP Director shall

circulate a draft memo to the members of the APR Committee to assure that it reflects the majority view of the faculty.

F. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

Criteria for TTF Tenure and Promotion review include teaching; research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service, as outlined in the sections below.

As a school with faculty representing multiple disciplines, expected standards of activity and outcomes vary. For example, service opportunities in some disciplines may be more limited than in others

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

Although there are customary teaching, research/scholarship, and service allocations for TTF in EFLP, it is also possible than a TTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, special projects, or leaves granted by the CBA needs to be specified and approved in writing by the Dean.

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 actual distribution of workload.

1. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Tenure requires demonstrated achievement in teaching; research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and service. Although a faculty member's role may emphasize one domain over another, achievement in one domain shall not substitute for lack of achievement in teaching, research, and service. Because promotion from assistant professor to associate professor typically occurs concurrently with the granting of tenure, the criteria for both are the same.

The following criteria shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching, research, and service.

a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited college or university.

b. Shall have regular graduate faculty status.

c. 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. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching, graduate and undergraduate advising, and instructional development. 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. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

i. Teaching: Given the school's involvement in degree programs and general education, it considers high quality instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. As described below, required performance indicators and standards used in the evaluation of teaching include a narrative, quantitative teaching evaluations, and peer evaluations. Submission of qualitative teaching evaluations is optional.

- A compelling narrative that demonstrates successful teaching during the period under review (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
- Quantitative results of student evaluations of all courses taught in the years under review (typically the last six years) (evaluations for all of teaching load in each academic year, plus all courses taught in the summers during those years)
  - Aggregate scores from student evaluations of teaching should typically be at or above 3.0 on a 5-point scale
  - Improvement in quantitative student evaluations of teaching over the years under review will also be valued
  - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
- Qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
  - Candidates who submit qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may submit a sample of such evaluations to demonstrate effective teaching, reflection, and growth; however, for every course section submitted, *all* qualitative comments from that section must be submitted
  - Qualitative comments should be generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns);

    - If the candidate chooses to submit qualitative evaluations, the teaching narrative should include how the candidate addressed relevant qualitative comments from past semesters;
  - All written evaluations from observations of classroom teaching conducted by colleagues within the years under review (typically the last six years), which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns)
    - Peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and/or reflect teaching excellence during the probationary period

ii. Graduate and Undergraduate Advising: The School believes that advising is a valued component of teaching, that students have the right to quality advising, and that faculty must be recognized for advising students. To that end, each faculty member will contribute to advising within EFLP and EDHD in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience. The School provides a variety of graduate degree programs as well as core courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels that serve as the foundation for many degree programs outside of the School. School faculty support these programs in a variety of ways, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership. The teaching narrative and artifacts should include one or more of the following:
  - Documentation of successful student advising (graduate and/or undergraduate), including the number of advisees
  - Documentation of service as a chair or member of a committee for completed Honors Project or other undergraduate research project
  - Documentation of service as a chair or member of a committee for completed dissertations/theses. Evidence of increased activity as chair or member of dissertation/thesis committees is valued.
  - Other evidence that documents outstanding performance in student academic advising

iii. Instructional Development: Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in EFLP are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. The tenured faculty member seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor must provide a narrative and documentation that includes some or all of the following. Some of these items could be included multiple times (e.g., refinement … for 2 different courses):
  - Course syllabi and other materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
    - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
    - Evidence of improvements or amendments made on the basis of student and peer evaluations of teaching is valued
  - Effective implementation innovative instructional techniques (e.g., use of technology and other resources to promote active student learning)
  - Refinement, modification, and improvement of existing courses
  - Successful creation of a new course

- Contribution to curriculum or program development
- Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills
- Independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students
- Teaching awards and distinctions

iv. In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the school consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to the candidate's specific case.

d. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity. Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central ongoing responsibility of all tenured and tenure-track 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 School's evaluation of faculty members who are under tenure and promotion to associate professor. Domains used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include publications, presentations, and performances; internal and external research/scholarship funding; research awards and honors; editorships; and reputation within the candidate's field.

Beginning in the first year of appointment, tenure-track faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date *Research Portfolio* that contains written records pertaining to their research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. Reviewers will use the portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of these activities.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include:

i. a compelling narrative that demonstrates success in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a statement of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity philosophy, (2) research, scholarship, and creative activity agenda and accomplishments, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns (if any) expressed in previous reviews have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;

ii. artifacts of research, scholarship, and creative activity that demonstrate productivity and qualifications for tenure and promotion to associate professor – the ability to do scholarly or creative work as indicated by publications, significant research and scholarship, presentation of refereed papers at regional or national meetings, or their equivalent in the creative or performing arts:

1. Publications, presentations, and other scholarship activity. Publications, presentations, and performances are major products of any research/ scholarship and, thus, central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are very significant. So, too, are the publication of

books, book chapters, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Journal editorships and associate editorships of peer-reviewed journals and other publications are noteworthy, as well.

- Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline.
- Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.
- Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with where faculty members are in the probationary period. Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. At minimum, probationary faculty members applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor shall have, on average, at least one refereed journal article (or equivalent) published or in press per year.
- The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work.
- Documented in press publications are considered published.
- In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline (e.g., a major book), a fewer number of publications shall be considered in evaluating this criterion
- Faculty shall have an average of at least one national or international peer reviewed presentation (or equivalent; e.g., regional or state presentation; invited presentation) at a professional conference each year.
- In the CV and/or the narrative, faculty in EFLP should indicate the acceptance rate and impact factors for articles published, the agency responsible for the publication, and the intended audience of the publication.

2. Internal and External Grants. In addition to supporting research, securing internal and external support is an important external validation of the quality of research and scholarship activity. While no specific quantity of research grant support is required for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, School expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. Performance indicators include number of grant applications submitted, agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal, significance and scope of the projects, research funds awarded, performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects, and conversion of the results of grant-funded projects into peer-reviewed presentations and publications. One (1) external grant award of more than $15,000 may be substituted for a journal article at tenure and promotion t associate professor.

3. Additional Considerations.
   - Research awards and honors.
   - Participation in institutionally initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship.
   - Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued, but not required, and shall not substitute for publications.
   - In their research/scholarship narrative, faculty members shall explain they have met stated criteria and how the performance indicators (i.e. artifacts) illustrate how they have made significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline.

iii. Reputation within the Candidate's Field. One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/scholarship is his/her reputation within the candidate's field. In the case of tenure and promotion to associate professor, TTF shall provide evidence in the narrative and/or the artifacts of an existing and growing reputation in the candidate's field (e.g., citations to research, honors and awards, impact factors for publications, invited presentations).

iv. Evaluation of both quantity and quality of scholarship shall be done by faculty review and validated by external reviewers.

e. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness. Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community and to the profession, and should demonstrate active participation and contribution and a continuous record of service involvement and emerging leadership at the school, college, university, and professional levels. The School defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of service include:

i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in your dossier that addresses how you perform these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and

ii. Artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative plus a combination of at

least four of the following, with an average of at least two per year during the period under review:

- leadership role (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, university, professional committees/associations;
- participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
- advising of student organizations;
- unpaid consultations;
- performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);
- membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
- scholarly journal editorial review board membership and/or manuscript review;
- community awards and other recognitions;
- written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
- service and professional recognitions; and
- or the equivalent

2. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to professor requires a cumulative record of high teaching effectiveness; substantial productivity in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity; and extensive service contributions within and external to BGSU. Although a faculty member's role may emphasize one domain over another, achievement in one domain shall not substitute for lack of achievement in teaching, research, and service.

The following criteria shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching, research, and service.

a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited college or university.

b. Shall have regular graduate faculty status.

c. 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. Successful candidates for promotion to professor will have an ongoing, established reputation as excellent, effective teachers. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include teaching, graduate and undergraduate advising, and instructional development. Reviewers will use the Teaching Portfolio as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of teaching include:

i. Teaching: Given the school's involvement in degree programs and general education, it considers high quality instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. As described below, required performance indicators used in the evaluation of teaching include a narrative, quantitative evaluations, and peer evaluations. Submission of qualitative teaching evaluations is optional.
   - A compelling narrative that demonstrates sustained effectiveness in teaching during the period under review (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a teaching philosophy, (2) a self-evaluation, which states how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed teaching, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;
   - Quantitative results of student evaluations of all courses taught in the years under review (typically the last six years) (evaluations for all of teaching load in each academic year, plus all course taught in the summers during those years)
     - Aggregate scores from student evaluations of teaching should typically be at or above 3.5 on a 5-point scale
     - Improvement in quantitative student evaluations of teaching over the years under review will also be valued
     - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
   - Qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may also be submitted
     - Candidates who submit qualitative comments from student evaluations of teaching may submit a sample of such evaluations to demonstrate excellence in teaching, reflection, and growth; however, for every course section submitted, *all* qualitative comments from that section must be submitted
     - Qualitative comments should be positive and demonstrate teaching excellence;
     - If the candidate chooses to submit qualitative evaluations, the teaching narrative should include how the candidate addressed relevant qualitative comments from past semesters;
   - All written evaluations from observations of classroom teaching conducted by colleagues within the years under review (typically the last six years), which demonstrate teaching excellence during the period under review.

ii. Graduate and Undergraduate Advising: The School believes that advising is a valued component of teaching, that students have the right to quality advising, and that faculty must be recognized for advising students. To that end, each faculty member will contribute to advising within EFLP and EDHD in a manner that best fits individual faculty characteristics, expertise, and experience. The School

provides a variety of graduate degree programs as well as core courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels that serve as the foundation for many degree programs outside of the School. School faculty support these programs in a variety of ways, including program advising at the undergraduate level and graduate level, thesis and dissertation advising, and committee membership. The teaching narrative and artifacts should include one or more of the following:

- Documentation of successful student advising (graduate and/or undergraduate), including the number of advisees
- Documentation of service as a chair or member of a committee for completed Honors Project or other undergraduate research project
- Documentation of services as a chair or member of a committee for completed dissertations/theses; where appropriate, candidates for promotion to professor should
- Other evidence that documents outstanding performance in student academic advising

iii. Instructional Development: Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in EFLP are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. The tenured faculty member seeking promotion to professor must provide a narrative and documentation that includes some or all of the following. Particular value will be placed on contribution to program curriculum and leadership. Some of these items could be included multiple times (e.g., refinement … for 2 different courses):

- Course syllabi and other materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
  - Participation in professional development to improve or enhance teaching is desirable, as well
  - Evidence of improvements or amendments made on the basis of student and peer evaluations of teaching is valued
- Effective implementation innovative instructional techniques (e.g., use of technology and other resources to promote active student learning)
- Refinement, modification, and improvement of existing courses
- Successful creation of a new course
- Contribution to curriculum or program development
- Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills
- Independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students
- Teaching awards and distinctions

iv. In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the school consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to the candidate's specific case.

d. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activity. Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central ongoing responsibility of all tenured and tenure-track 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 School's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for promotion from associate professor to professor. Domains used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include publications, presentations, and performances; internal and external research/scholarship funding; research awards and honors; editorships; and reputation within the candidate's field.

Performance indicators and standards that are used in the evaluation of research, scholarship, and creative activity include:

i. a compelling narrative that demonstrates high level and consistent productivity in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of the following: (1) a statement of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity philosophy, (2) research, scholarship, and/or creative activity agenda and accomplishments, (3) a statement of professional growth over the year(s) reviewed, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed, and (4) an explanation of the artifacts in the dossier;

ii. artifacts of research, scholarship, and creative activity that demonstrate qualifications for promotion to professor – an established reputation within the candidate's field as evidenced by a record of productive scholarship, significant research, presentation of refereed papers at regional or national meetings, or the equivalent in the creative or performing arts:

1. Publications, presentations, and other scholarship activity. Publications, presentations, and performances are major products of any research/ scholarship and, thus, central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are very significant. So, too, are the publication of books, book chapters, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Journal editorships and associate editorships of peer-reviewed journals and other publications are noteworthy, as well.
    - Scholarship shall show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline. Candidates for promotion shall provide evidence of the impact of their work in the candidate's field (e.g., citation record)
    - Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.
    - Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. At minimum, a candidate applying for promotion to professor shall have, on average, at least one refereed journal article (or equivalent) in press per year for each of the past six years and, regardless of when the candidate submits a portfolio for promotion to professor, the candidate

shall have at least six refereed journal articles or equivalents since promotion to associate professor.

- The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work.
- Documented in press publications are considered published.
- In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline (e.g., a major book), a fewer number of publications shall be considered in evaluating this criterion.
- Faculty shall have an average of at least one national or international peer reviewed presentation (or equivalent; e.g., regional or state presentation; invited presentation) at a professional conference each year for the past six years and at least six since promotion to associate professor.
- In the CV and/or the narrative, faculty in EFLP should indicate the acceptance rate and impact factors for articles published, the agency responsible for the publication, and the intended audience of the publication.

2. Internal and External Grants. In addition to supporting research, securing internal and external support is an important external validation of the quality of research and scholarship activity. While no specific quantity of research grant support is required for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit, School expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. Performance indicators include number of grant applications submitted, agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal, significance and scope of the projects, research funds awarded, performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects, and conversion of the results of grant-funded projects into peer-reviewed presentations and publications. One (1) external grant award of more than $15,000 may be substituted for a journal article at promotion to professor.

3. Additional Considerations.
   - Research awards and honors.
   - Participation in institutionally initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship.
   - Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued, but not required, and shall not substitute for publications.
   - In their research/scholarship narrative, faculty members shall explain they have met stated criteria and how the performance indicators (i.e. artifacts) illustrate how they have made significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline.

iii. Reputation within the Candidate's Field. One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/scholarship is his/her reputation within the candidate's field. In the case of promotion to professor, the candidate shall provide evidence in the narrative and/or the artifacts of a well-established reputation as a scholarly leader in the candidate's field (e.g., citations to research, honors and awards, impact factors for publications, invited presentations).

iv. Evaluation of both quantity and quality of scholarship shall be done by faculty review and validated by external reviewers.

e. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness. Service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking promotion to professor shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community and to the profession, and should demonstrate significant and successful leadership roles in a continuous record of service involvement. The School defines service as performance of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of service include:

i. Narrative (no more than 5 double-spaced pages) consisting of a statement of philosophy and commitment to service and an explanation of the artifacts in your dossier that addresses how you perform these duties in an effective, thorough, and timely manner; and

ii. Artifacts to illustrate effective implementation of the service philosophy and commitment to service. For promotion to professor, the service section of the dossier shall include the narrative; evidence of leadership (e.g., officer, chair) in program, school, college, and/or university committees, and evidence of leadership (e.g., officer, chair) in professional committees/associations; plus a combination of at least four of the following, with an average of at least two per year during the period under review (all years since promotion and tenure will be considered and reviewed, with emphasis placed on the six years prior to application for promotion to professor):
   - participation in program, school, college, or university committees (e.g., governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams);
   - advising of student organizations;
   - unpaid consultations;
   - performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities (e.g., duties handled by faculty serving as a center director, program coordinator, school director, and associate dean);

- membership and active involvement (e.g., committee membership, conference programming and proposal review, facilitation of professional development) with professional disciplinary organizations at the local, state, national, or international levels;
- scholarly journal editorial review board membership and/or manuscript review;
- community awards and other recognitions;
- written statements or testimonial from community and professional organization;
- service and professional recognitions; and
- or the equivalent

iii. For promotion to professor, evidence of significant professional service at a national and/or international level will be valued.

G. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

1. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of Materials for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
   a. A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor must notify the School Director that he or she is a candidate for tenure (in accordance with the CBA and other University guidelines).
   b. External Review. To achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate must go through an external review process in addition to the internal review at BGSU. The School Director will facilitate the external review process following the procedures provided by the Provost's Office.
   c. Probationary TTF will submit portfolios to the School Director on or before a date specified by the School Director, in accordance with University guidelines. The candidate is encouraged to seek assistance in preparing the portfolio from his or her mentor and other faculty prior to submission to the Director.
   d. The School Director will review each set of credentials for completeness. Portfolios will be made available to the unit's eligible voters. Portfolios should include at least the following:
      i. Application Cover Sheet for Promotion and Tenure Review.
      ii. EFLP's Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion document.
      iii. EPR letters from all levels of review.
      iv. APR letters.
      v. A current curriculum vitae in approved BGSU format.
      vi. Narratives for each of the three areas of review: teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
      vii. Artifacts/evidence of progress toward tenure taken from the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
      viii. The School Director will make sure that external review letters are incorporated into the portfolio.

2. Internal Procedures for Creation and Submission of Materials for Promotion to Professor
   a. A candidate for promotion to professor must notify the School Director that he or she is a candidate for promotion (in accordance with the CBA and other University guidelines).
   b. External Review. To achieve promotion to professor, a candidate must go through an external review process in addition to the internal review at BGSU. The School Director will facilitate the external review process following the procedures provided by the Provost's Office.
   c. Candidates for promotion to professor will submit portfolios to the School Director on or before a date specified by the School Director, in accordance with University guidelines.
   d. The School Director will review each set of credentials for completeness. Portfolios will be made available to the unit's eligible voters. Portfolios should include at least the following:
      i. Application Cover Sheet for Promotion and Tenure Review.
      ii. EFLP's Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion document.
      iii. A current curriculum vitae in approved BGSU format.
      iv. Narratives for each of the three areas of review: teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
      v. Artifacts/evidence of progress toward tenure taken from the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
      vi. The School Director will make sure that external review letters are incorporated into the portfolio.

Approved by the School of Educational Foundations, Leadership & Policy

Director Patrick Pauken Date March 14, 2018

Reviewed by the Dean [signature] Date 4/3/18

✓ concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):

Reviewed by the Provost & Senior Vice President [signature] Date 4-3-18

X concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):
