

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: **Department of Finance**

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

In the case of candidates for Annual and Enhanced Performance Reviews, after full evaluations of candidates' teaching and service, Annual and Enhanced Performance Review Committees and/or the Department Chair will make one of the following recommendations:

- Strongly recommend that the candidate be reappointed;
- Recommend that the candidate be reappointed;
- Recommend that the candidate not be reappointed;

These recommendations must be accompanied by comments based on the candidate's teaching and service as described in the materials supplied by the candidates.

❖ Criteria and Standards used for Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) of NTTF

a) Overview of Criteria to be Used

The Department of Finance, Bowling Green State University, has developed the standards and criteria discussed below. These are presented in this order: the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching, and service; the minimum performance levels required for annual reappointment; the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for annual reappointment review develop and execute effective teaching and are actively involved in service to their departments, the College of Business Administration, Bowling Green State University, and/or to the profession outside of the University in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in teaching and service.

(1) Levels of Teaching and Service Performance

The candidate's teaching and service performance is evaluated using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

(2) Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service

Teaching is considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carries more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for annual reappointment, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed the following:

Good in teaching and service

- (3) Reappointment requires that the candidate be active and productive in teaching and service. As noted below, it is not possible to be reappointed if the candidate is deficient (below Good) in any of these areas (if chosen).

b) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Teaching

(1) General Guidelines

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, evaluators examine the candidate's teaching portfolios which contain student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement as required items, as stated in (a) below. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Candidates are encouraged to include other relevant items from the list in (b), (c), and (d) below:

(a) Required items

- (i) Student evaluations
- (ii) Peer evaluations (at least one per year)
- (iii) Syllabi
- (iv) Teaching philosophy statement

(b) Effective delivery of classroom instruction

- (i) Documented outcome assessment results
- (ii) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations
- (iii) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

(c) Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.

- (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research
- (ii) Teaching independent studies
- (iii) Advising special projects
- (iv) Teaching awards
- (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity

(d) Professional development and teaching support activity; e.g.

- (i) Course development
- (ii) Curriculum/program development
- (iii) Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
- (iv) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
- (v) Innovative teaching methods development
- (vi) Professional development related to teaching
- (vii) Textbooks/instructional materials development
- (viii) Supportive letters
- (ix) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities

- (x) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of practitioner-oriented or interdisciplinary course

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence to evaluators of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of candidates for reappointment. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. The Department must also provide written discussion of how these peer evaluations compare to other faculty of comparable rank and experience. (Chairs and appropriate faculty may need some leeway in identifying an appropriate benchmark against which the candidate's peer evaluations will be compared.)

Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent evaluation of teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good.

(2) Specific Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (the professional judgment of the evaluator(s) will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent:** The teaching performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good:** The teaching performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.

- **Fair:** The teaching performance of candidates for annual performance review reappointment is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

c) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Service

(1) General Guidelines

Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- (a) University Governance
 - (i) Leadership positions
 - (ii) Membership on College committees
 - (iii) Membership on Department committees
 - (iv) Membership on University committees
 - (v) Other University governance activities
- (b) Professional Activities
 - (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
 - (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (iii) Membership in professional organizations
- (c) Service Recognition Awards
- (d) Other Service Activities
 - (i) Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
 - (ii) Support department programs that provide services to students
 - (iii) Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
 - (iv) Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students
 - (v) Administrative assignments
 - (vi) Advising student clubs

- (vii)Oversee preparation for student competitions
- (viii)Editorial boards
- (ix) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
- (x) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
- (xi) Working with Centers and Institutes

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

(2) Specific Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities (the professional judgment of the reviewers will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent**: The service performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good**: The service performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair**: The service performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy.
- **Marginally Unacceptable**: The service performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy.
- **Clearly Unacceptable**: The service performance of candidates for annual performance review is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities.

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

❖ **Criteria and Standards used for Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) of NTTF**

a) Overview of Criteria to be Used

The Department of Finance, Bowling Green State University, has developed the standards and criteria discussed below which are presented in this order: the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching and service; the minimum performance levels required for enhanced reappointment; the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for enhanced reappointment review develop and execute effective teaching and are actively involved in service to their departments, the College of Business, Bowling Green State University, and/or to the profession outside of the University in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in teaching and service. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contributions in teaching and service.

(1) Levels of Teaching and Service Performance

The candidate's teaching and service performance is evaluated using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

(2) Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service

Teaching is considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carries more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for Enhanced reappointment, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed the following:

Good in teaching and service

(3) Evaluation for purposes herein discussed typically encompass the past three academic years of candidate's career at BGSU.

(4) Reappointment requires that the candidate be active and productive in teaching and service. As noted below, it is not possible to be reappointed if the candidate is deficient (below Good) in either of these areas.

b) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Teaching

(1) General Guidelines

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, the evaluators examine the candidate's teaching portfolios which contain student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a

teaching philosophy statement as required items, as stated in (a) below. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Candidates are encouraged to include other relevant items from the list in (b), (c), and (d):

- (a) Required items
 - (i) Student evaluations
 - (ii) Peer evaluations (at least one per year)
 - (iii) Syllabi
 - (iv) Teaching philosophy statement
- (b) Effective delivery of classroom instruction
 - (i) Documented outcome assessment results
 - (ii) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations
 - (iii) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.
- (c) Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.
 - (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research
 - (ii) Teaching independent studies
 - (iii) Advising special projects
 - (iv) Teaching awards
 - (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity
- (d) Professional development and teaching support activity; e.g.
 - (i) Course development
 - (ii) Curriculum/program development
 - (iii) Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
 - (iv) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
 - (v) Innovative teaching methods development
 - (vi) Professional development related to teaching
 - (vii) Textbooks/instructional materials development
 - (viii) Supportive letters
 - (ix) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
 - (x) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of practitioner-oriented or interdisciplinary course

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence to the voting faculty of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of candidates for reappointment. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. The Department must also provide written discussion of how these peer evaluations compare to other faculty of comparable rank and experience. (Chairs and appropriate faculty may need some leeway in identifying an appropriate benchmark against which the candidate's peer evaluations will be compared.)

Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good..

(2) Specific Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (the professional judgment of the evaluators will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent:** The teaching performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good:** The teaching performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair:** The teaching performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and

effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.

- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

c) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Service

(1) General Guidelines

Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- (a) University Governance
 - (i) Leadership positions
 - (ii) Membership on College committees
 - (iii) Membership on Department committees
 - (iv) Membership on University committees
 - (v) Other University governance activities
- (b) Professional Activities
 - (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
 - (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (iii) Membership in professional organizations
- (c) Service Recognition Awards
- (d) Other Service Activities
 - (i) Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
 - (ii) Support department programs that provide services to students
 - (iii) Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
 - (iv) Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students
 - (v) Administrative assignments
 - (vi) Advising student clubs
 - (vii) Oversee preparation for student competitions
 - (viii) Editorial boards
 - (ix) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
 - (x) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
 - (xi) Working with Centers and Institutes

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further,

significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

(2) Specific Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities (the professional judgment of the evaluator(s) will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good:** The service performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for enhanced performance review is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the review period.

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

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

Annual and Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
 - I. Student Evaluations
 - II. Peer Evaluations (at least one per year)
 - III. Course Syllabi
 - IV. A teaching philosophy statement
- B. Evaluation of Service Performance
 - I. University Governance Activities
 - II. Professional Activities
 - III. Service Recognition Awards

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair. Feedback from department faculty shall be solicited by the Department Chair and incorporated into the Chair's evaluation memo to the Dean.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Criteria used for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

- a) The Department of Finance has developed the standards and criteria discussed below. These are presented in this order: the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching, and service; the minimum performance levels required for promotion to Lecturer; the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for promotion to Lecturer develop and execute effective teaching and are actively involved in service to their departments, the College of Business, Bowling Green State University, and/or to the profession outside of the University in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in teaching and service.

(1) Levels of Teaching and Service Performance

The candidate's teaching and service are evaluated using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

(2) Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service

Teaching is considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carries more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for promotion to Lecturer, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed the following:

Good in teaching and service

- b) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Teaching

- (1) General Guidelines - Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. Greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, and the candidate is

required to provide student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi for the classes taught, and a teaching philosophy statement as stated in the list (a) below. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. The candidate is encouraged to provide at least two to three additional items from the list below in (b), (c), and (d).

- (a) Required items
 - (i) Student evaluations
 - (ii) Peer evaluations (at least one per year)
 - (iii) Syllabi
 - (iv) Teaching philosophy statement

- (b) Effective delivery of classroom instruction
 - (i) Documented outcome assessment results
 - (ii) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations
 - (iii) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

- (c) Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.
 - (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research
 - (ii) Teaching independent studies
 - (iii) Advising special projects
 - (iv) Teaching awards
 - (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity

- (d) Professional development and teaching support activity; e.g.
 - (i) Course development
 - (ii) Curriculum/program development
 - (iii) Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
 - (iv) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
 - (v) Innovative teaching methods development
 - (vi) Professional development related to teaching
 - (vii) Textbooks/instructional materials development
 - (viii) Supportive letters
 - (ix) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
 - (x) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of practitioner-oriented or interdisciplinary course

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

The candidate's overall teaching records since hiring as instructor at BGSU are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective,

graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent evaluation of teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good.

(v) Specific Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness (the professional judgment of the evaluators will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent**: The teaching performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good**: The teaching performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair**: The teaching performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable**: The teaching performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.

- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

c) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Service

- (1) General Guidelines - Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

(a) University Governance

- (i) Leadership positions
- (ii) Membership on College committees
- (iii) Membership on Department committees
- (iv) Membership on University committees
- (v) Other University governance activities

(b) Professional Activities

- (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
- (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
- (iii) Membership in professional organizations

(c) Service Recognition Awards

(d) Other Service Activities

- (i) Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
- (ii) Support department programs that provide services to students
- (iii) Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
- (iv) Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students
- (v) Administrative assignments
- (vi) Advising student clubs
- (vii) Oversee preparation for student competitions
- (viii) Editorial boards
- (ix) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
- (x) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
- (xi) Work with a Center or Institute

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

(2) Specific Standards -The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities (the professional judgment of the evaluators will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good:** The service performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the review period.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

a) Overview of Criteria Used by the Committee

The Department of Finance at Bowling Green State University has developed the standards and criteria discussed below. These are presented in this order: the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching and service; the minimum performance levels required for promotion to Senior Lecturer; the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer have and continue to develop and execute effective teaching programs, and have acceptable records in service. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but

can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contributions in teaching and service.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer entails past and present activities in the areas of teaching and service. However, it is not considered adequate to merely continue to perform at the same levels of activity as are needed for promotion to Lecturer. It is expected that candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will also have taken the initiative and/or displayed leadership in one or more of the areas of teaching and service.

University policy does not establish a minimum number of years of service at the Lecturer level prior to promotion to Senior Lecturer. However, the level and quality of contributions expected in the areas of teaching and service would suggest that a period of time comparable to that spent working toward promotion to Lecturer is generally desirable in order to achieve the record normally expected of a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer. In unusual cases where candidates have achieved such a record in a shorter period of time, then promotion to Senior Lecturer may occur. Thus, the appropriate criterion will be whether the candidate has the necessary record, including record as Lecturer, rather than whether the candidate has been a Lecturer long enough. Similarly, candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should not be held to a higher standard for promotion simply because they have been a Lecturer longer than "normal". Again, the record of accomplishments is the determinant and not the time needed to achieve that record

(1) Levels of Teaching and Service, if chosen, Performance - Reviewers evaluate the performance of a candidate's teaching and service using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

(2) Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service

Teaching is considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carries more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for promotion to Senior Lecturer, candidates must be judged to:

Excellent in teaching and Good or better in service.

(3) Evaluation will encompass the candidate's entire professional academic career. Primary emphasis will be placed on the candidate's contributions since promotion to Lecturer.

b) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Teaching

(1) General Guidelines - Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. Greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, and the candidate is required to provide student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi for the classes taught, and a teaching philosophy statement as stated in the list (a) below. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. The candidate is encouraged to provide at least four to five additional items from the list below in (b), (c), and (d).

- (a) Required items
 - (i) Student evaluations
 - (ii) Peer evaluations (at least one per year)
 - (iii) Syllabus
 - (iv) Teaching philosophy statement
- (b) Effective delivery of classroom instruction
 - (i) Documented outcome assessment results
 - (ii) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations
 - (iii) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.
- (c) Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.
 - (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research
 - (ii) Teaching independent studies
 - (iii) Advising special projects
 - (iv) Teaching awards
 - (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity
- (d) Professional development and teaching support activity; e.g.
 - (i) Course development
 - (ii) Curriculum/program development
 - (iii) Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
 - (iv) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
 - (v) Innovative teaching methods development
 - (vi) Professional development related to teaching
 - (vii) Textbooks/instructional materials development
 - (viii) Supportive letters
 - (ix) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
 - (x) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of practitioner-oriented or interdisciplinary course

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of candidates' teaching performance.

Overall teaching records during the candidate's BGSU academic career are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period. Emphasis will be on the candidate's teaching record since promotion to Lecturer.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

The successful candidate must have an established reputation as an effective teacher and this effectiveness must extend beyond classroom-related activities. In addition to traditional measures of effective classroom teaching (e.g. student and peer evaluations

of the candidate's performance as a teacher), candidates should exhibit contributions in other areas such as curriculum and course development, mentoring of junior faculty on teaching-related matters, and student recruitment and retention; all factors which create a learning environment that enables students and faculty to develop the knowledge, skills and capabilities needed for personal success, and which contribute to the academic vitality of the College and University.

The successful candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have initiated teaching or teaching-related activities intended to benefit students and/or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting "how to teach in my discipline" workshops, developing new curriculum for students in the candidate's discipline, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a "teaching mentor", etc. The emphasis should not be on "directing" others to achieve certain goals, but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process.

Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent evaluation of teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good.

(1) **Specific Standards** - The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, for the purpose of evaluating candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer (the professional judgment of the Committee members will determine which of the following categories are satisfied by the quantity and quality of the candidate's record):

- **Excellent:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.

- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at Senior Lecturer least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

c) Standards Applied and Evidence Examined in the Evaluation of Service

- (1) **General Guidelines - Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to candidates' professions/disciplines or external community, evolves during a faculty member's academic career. It is generally expected that candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have made substantial contributions in the area of service. However, as with teaching, the candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer is expected to have assumed a leadership role in the area of service. Passive participation on a large number of committees will not be considered adequate. Leadership is not interpreted to mean assuming administrative or supervisory roles, but rather is interpreted as proactive, creative activity which is intended to achieve a common objective.**

Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- (a) University Governance
 - (i) Leadership positions Membership on College committees
 - (ii) Membership on Department committees
 - (iii) Membership on University committees
 - (iv) Other University governance activities
- (b) Professional Activities
 - (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
 - (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (iii) Membership in professional organizations
- (c) Service Recognition Awards
- (d) Other Service Activities
 - (i) Administrative assignments; Editorial boards
 - (ii) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
 - (iii) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
 - (iv) Work with Centers or Institutes

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities. As already indicated for teaching, activities since promotion to Lecturer will be given primary weight.

Successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will also have displayed at least moderate leadership abilities in their service activities. This may take the form of chairing committees, workshops, etc., but could also be accomplished by being influential and/or instrumental in working toward completion of the task assigned to a group of individuals.

- (2) **Specific Standards-** The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities (the professional judgment of the Committee members will determine which of the following categories the quantity and quality of the candidate's record satisfies):
- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section X.4.A.4.); and (d) display substantial leadership in performing service activities.
 - **Good:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section X.4.A.4.); and (d) display leadership in performing service activities.
 - **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made a contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity, in community engagement, or other service activity as listed in (Section X.4.A.4).
 - **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee

requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.

- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the review period.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

Promotion Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
 - I. Student Evaluations
 - II. Peer Evaluations
 - III. Course Syllabi
 - IV. A teaching philosophy statement
 - V. Teaching Recognition Awards
- B. Evaluation of Service Performance
 - I. University Governance Activities
 - II. Professional Activities
 - III. Service Recognition Awards

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

A. Criteria used for Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews of TTF

In the case of candidates for reappointment, after full evaluations of teaching, research, and service, the Chair will make one of the following recommendations:

- Strongly recommend that the candidate be reappointed;
- Recommend that the candidate be reappointed;
- Recommend that the candidate not be reappointed;

These recommendations must be accompanied by comments based on the candidate's teaching, service and research as described in the materials supplied by the candidates.

Annual Performance Reviews for TTF

The candidate's teaching, research, and service performance is evaluated using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

While teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carry more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates, reappointment also requires demonstrated evidence of service records. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for reappointment, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed one of the following:

- (a) Good in teaching and research, and Fair or better in service
- (b) Excellent in teaching and Fair or better in research and service
- (c) Excellent in research and Fair or better in teaching and service.

No candidate who is evaluated as Marginally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable in teaching, research or service may receive a positive recommendation for reappointment. Further, no candidate who is evaluated as Fair in all three areas may receive a positive recommendation for reappointment.

The items listed below as Components to be Evaluated under Teaching, Research and Service are not ranked. The suggested location of various activities under the categories of teaching, research and service is intended to provide general guidelines to the candidates and the Committee. A candidate may choose to list an activity under a category other than that suggested in this document (e.g. listing authoring of a textbook under research rather than teaching). In such cases, the candidate must include documentation justifying such a classification. Each activity should be listed in only one category.

Teaching:

BGSU is committed to providing all of our students with a high educational experience, with faculty members providing an exceptional classroom learning experience and success in reaching the learning outcomes established.

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While the greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components will be used in judging the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, as listed

below in (a), (b), or (c), in addition to the required items of Classroom Teaching as listed in (a) including student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Other items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

a) Classroom Teaching

- Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (required)
- Student evaluations of teaching (required)
- Peer observations and evaluations of teaching (required)
- Syllabi (required)
- Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students
- Publication of a textbook (new – second or higher edition counts with less weight)
- Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- Documentation of student learning outcomes
- Independent or special study courses taught
- Teaching awards and distinctions
- Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

b) Instructional Development

- Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- Curriculum/program development activities
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching
- Assessment of student activities
- Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
- Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
- Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.

c) Other Contributions to Student Learning

- Advisement of student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions
- Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
- Involvement in activities to promote department programs and services to current and prospective students
- Participation in University, college, or department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
- Other activities that contribute to effective teaching

Professional judgment must be applied in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance. Overall teaching records over the previous year are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period. While student teaching evaluations are an important indicator of teaching effectiveness, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size of class, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all have an impact on a candidate's rating. Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and any comparison made across candidates.

- **Excellent**: The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good**: The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair**: The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable**: The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable**: The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Research:

To facilitate his/her professional development, each probationary faculty member is required to develop a written statement of research goals consistent with the broad mission of the college and the departmental research goals and philosophy. The statement of research goals is to be taken into consideration in the evaluation of the candidate's research performance along with the Workload agreement signed at the beginning of the year.

The Committee evaluates the candidate's research performance based on written records contained in the candidate's research portfolio. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities

- Scholarly books
- Refereed journal articles
- Monographs
- Proceedings publications
- Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
- Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach and engagement
- Published book reviews
- Published cases
- Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
- Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
- Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
- Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
- Receipt of research honors and awards
- Professional development activities related to research
- Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
- Work in progress
- Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research

b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work

- Grant applications submitted
- Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
- Significance and scope of the project(s)
- Research funds awarded
- Performance of duties as principal investigator
- Research fellowships awarded

c) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement

- Contributions to the University Statistical Consulting Center
- Participation in University, college, or department outreach and engagement activities
- Scholarly contributions in addressing problems of relevance to the community/external agencies in the areas of statistics and operations research
- Unpaid private consulting

d) Reputation with the Discipline

- Research honors and awards received

The members of the Committee give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline, which relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. Further, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publication will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals and on the impact of a publication on the discipline such as the citation indexes compiled by the Google Scholar.

- **Excellent:** The research performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they; a) provide evidence of quality research with more than one B level or above peer reviewed journal articles during the evaluative year, among which one or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of research grant(s), research award(s), or other research related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Good:** The research performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they; (a) provide evidence of quality research with more than one B level peer reviewed journal articles during the evaluative year; (b) provide evidence of the successful attainment of research grant(s) and/or other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Fair:** The research performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they; (a) demonstrate the ability to conduct quality research with one B level peer reviewed journal article during the evaluative year; (b) supplement an acceptable research record with evidence of involvement in other activities listed in other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The research performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they; (a) have below B level or no peer reviewed journal article during the evaluative year; and (b) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** Candidates who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Service:

The participation in activities that benefit the academic discipline, the students, faculty, programs, and mission of the department and/or college and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession and the external community will evolve during the probationary period. Activities considered in the evaluation of service component include:

a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance

- Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
- Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
- Honors and awards received

b) External Community Service and Engagement

- Paid and unpaid professional service to public and private sector organizations
- Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
- Honors and awards received

c) Professional Service

- Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
 - Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - Organization of professional meetings and conferences
 - Honors and awards received
- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good:** The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities.

Enhanced Performance Review (Mid probationary) for TTF

The candidate's teaching, research, and service performance is evaluated using the following five categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.

While teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carry more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates, reappointment also requires demonstrated evidence of service records. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for reappointment, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed one of the following:

- (a) Good in teaching and research, and Fair or better in service
- (b) Excellent in teaching and Fair or better in research and service
- (c) Excellent in research and Fair or better in teaching and service.

No candidate who is evaluated as Marginally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable in teaching, research or service may receive a positive recommendation for reappointment. Further, no candidate who is evaluated as Fair in all three areas may receive a positive recommendation for reappointment.

The items listed below as Components to be evaluated under Teaching, Research and Service are not ranked. The suggested location of various activities under the categories of teaching, research and service is intended to provide general guidelines to the candidates and the Committee. A candidate may choose to list an activity under a category other than that suggested in this document (e.g. listing authoring of a textbook under research rather than teaching). In such cases the candidate must include documentation justifying such a classification. Each activity should be listed in only one category.

Teaching:

BGSU is committed to providing all of our students with a high educational experience, with faculty members providing an exceptional classroom learning experience and success in reaching the learning outcomes established.

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While the greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components will be used in evaluating the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, as listed below in (a), (b), or (c), in addition to the required items of Classroom Teaching as listed in (a) including student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Other items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

a) Classroom Teaching

- Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (required)
- Student evaluations of teaching (required)
- Peer observations and evaluations of teaching (required)
- Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students
- Course syllabi (required)

- Publication of a textbook (new – second or higher edition and more counts with less weight)
- Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- Documentation of student learning outcomes
- Independent or special study courses taught
- Teaching awards and distinctions
- Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

b) Instructional Development

- Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- Curriculum/program development activities
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching
- Assessment of student activities
- Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
- Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
- Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.

c) Other Contributions to Student Learning

- Advisement of student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions
- Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
- Involvement in activities to promote department programs and services to current and prospective students
- Participation in University, college, or department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
- Other activities that contribute to effective teaching

Professional judgment must be applied in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance. Overall teaching records over the enhanced performance review period are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period. While student teaching evaluations are an important indicator of teaching effectiveness, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size of class, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all have an impact on a candidate's rating. Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and any comparison made across candidates.

- **Excellent:** The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.

- **Good:** The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair:** The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Research:

To facilitate his/her professional development, each probationary faculty member is required to develop a written statement of research goals and philosophy consistent with the broad mission of the college. The statement of research goals and philosophy is to be taken into consideration in the evaluation of the candidate's research performance along with the workload agreements from the enhanced review period. This should not be a counting of publications, but a careful review of the research and research potential and path of the candidate. Care should be taken to recognize the time horizons involved in the publishing process. However, a candidate who cannot document an ongoing research program should expect to be judged Clearly Unacceptable. At the time of the tenure decision, the actual productivity will become a focus of the decision.

The candidate's research performance is based on written records contained in the candidate's research portfolio. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities

- Scholarly books
- Refereed journal articles
- Monographs
- Proceedings publications
- Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings

- Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach and engagement
 - Published book reviews
 - Published cases
 - Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
 - Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
 - Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
 - Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
 - Receipt of research honors and awards
 - Professional development activities related to research
 - Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
 - Work in progress
 - Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research
- b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work
- Grant applications submitted
 - Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
 - Significance and scope of the project(s)
 - Research funds awarded
 - Performance of duties as principal investigator
 - Research fellowships awarded
- c) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
- Contributions to the University Statistical Consulting Center
 - Participation in University, college, or department outreach and engagement activities
 - Scholarly contributions in addressing problems of relevance to the community/external agencies in the areas of statistics and operations research
 - Unpaid private consulting
- d) Reputation with the Discipline
- Evaluations by external reviewers
 - Research honors and awards received

Evaluators give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline, which relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. Further, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publication will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals (see attached Department of Finance Journal Article Classifications and Guidelines in Appendix A) and on the impact of a publication on the discipline such as the citation indexes compiled by the Google Scholar.

- **Excellent:** The research performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Excellent** if they; a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of more than one B level or above peer reviewed journal articles per year, among which two or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of research grant(s), research award(s), or other research related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Good:** The research performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Good** if they; (a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of one B level or above peer reviewed journal article per year, among which one or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of the successful attainment of research grant(s) and/or other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Fair:** The research performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Fair** if they; (a) demonstrate the ability to conduct quality research on average at the rate of one B level peer reviewed journal article per year; (b) supplement an acceptable research record with evidence of involvement in other activities listed in other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The research performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they; (a) have less than an average of one B level peer reviewed journal article per year; and (b) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** Candidates for reappointment who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Service:

The participation in activities that benefit the academic discipline, the students, faculty, programs, and mission of the department and/or college and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession and the external community will evolve during the probationary period. Activities considered in the evaluation of service component include:

a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance

- Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
- Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
- Honors and awards received

b) External Community Service and Engagement

- Unpaid professional service to public and private sector organizations
- Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
- Honors and awards received

c) Professional Service

- Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
 - Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - Organization of professional meetings and conferences
 - Honors and awards received
- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good:** The service performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the Probationary Period.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance
 - Student Evaluations
 - Peer Evaluations
 - Course Syllabi
 - Teaching Philosophy Statement
 - Program/Curriculum Development
 - Teaching Recognition Awards

- B. Evaluation of Research Performance
 - Refereed and Non-Refereed Journal Articles
 - Scholarly Books, Book Chapters, and Book Reviews
 - Other Publications (e.g., Monographs)
 - Paper Presentations
 - Journal Editorship
 - Research Grants, Honors and Awards
 - Other Research-related Activities (e.g., journal article review, session chair, etc.)
 - Research Philosophy Statement
 - External Reviews on Research Performance (for EPR only)

- C. Evaluation of Service Performance
 - University Governance Activities
 - Professional Activities
 - Service Recognition Awards

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair. Feedback from tenured faculty shall be solicited by the Department Chair and incorporated into the Chair's evaluation memo to the Dean.

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

A. Standards for Tenure (Art. 14, sec. 6.3) and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (Art. 14, sec. 6.4)

1. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching, Research, and Service

Teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carry more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed one of the following:

- (1) Good in teaching and in research, and fair or better in service
- (2) Excellent in teaching and fair or better in research and service
- (3) Excellent in research and fair or better in teaching and service

No candidate who is evaluated as Marginally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable in any of the areas at the time the tenure or promotion decision is made will receive a positive recommendation. Further, no candidate who is evaluated as Fair in all three areas at the time the tenure or promotion decision is made receives a positive recommendation.

2. Granting of tenure or promotion requires that the candidate be active and productive in all of the three areas of teaching, research and service. As noted below, it is not possible to be granted tenure or promotion if the candidate is deficient in any one of these three areas. However, it is possible for a faculty member to continuously make strong contributions in only one or two of these areas, and yet that candidate may not be judged acceptable for tenure or promotion.

Teaching:

BGSU is committed to providing all of our students with a high educational experience, with faculty members providing an exceptional classroom learning experience and success in reaching the learning outcomes established. It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While the greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components will be used in judging the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, in addition to the required items of student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Other items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

- (1) Classroom Teaching
 - (a) Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (required)
 - (b) Student evaluation of teaching (required)
 - (c) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching (required)
 - (d) Syllabi (required)
 - (e) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
 - (f) Documentation of student learning outcomes

- (g) Teaching awards and distinctions
 - (h) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching
- (2) Non-classroom Teaching/Advising, e.g.,
 - (a) Advising students
 - (b) Guiding graduate thesis
 - (c) Teaching independent studies
 - (d) Teaching special studies
 - (e) Advising student clubs, special projects/competition
 - (3) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
 - (a) Oversight of student activities related to service learning
 - (b) Efforts to incorporate external community problems and issues into the course content
 - (c) Provision of educational opportunities to the external community in the areas of financial planning, corporate finance, international finance, financial institutions, and/or investment advice
 - (4) Teaching Support Activities, e.g.
 - (a) Course development
 - (b) Curriculum/program development
 - (c) Participation on curriculum activities
 - (d) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
 - (e) Innovative teaching methods development
 - (f) Professional development related to teaching
 - (g) Textbooks/instructional materials development
 - (h) Contributions to departmental efforts to assess student achievement of program learning objectives

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance. Please note that publishing case studies may, in certain situations, be considered as either teaching related activity or research related activity, depending on the material covered in those cases. Unless otherwise adequately explained by the candidate, publishing case studies will be considered teaching related activity, and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

Overall teaching records over the probationary period (with emphasis on teaching performance at Bowling Green State University) are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence to the Committee of the candidate's ability as a teacher. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent evaluation of teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good.

- **Excellent**: The teaching performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good**: The teaching performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair**: The teaching performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable**: The teaching performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable**: The teaching performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Research:

The Committee evaluates the candidate's research performance based on written records contained in the candidate's research portfolio. Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing research program resulting in scholarly publications and presentations at scholarly meetings. Particular emphasis is placed upon publications and presentations juried by professional peers at the regional and national levels. The evaluation of research involves assessing both the quantity and quality of research activity and output. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates are based on the total research record, research performed and published while candidates are at BGSU is given primary emphasis.

The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

- (1) Publications
 - (a) Books (non-textbooks)
 - (b) Journal articles
 - (c) Monographs
- (2) Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach, and engagement activities.
- (3) Presentations
 - (a) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
 - (b) Proceeding publications
- (4) Other Contributions
 - (a) Published book reviews
 - (b) Published cases
- (5) Research Recognition
 - (a) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
 - (b) Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
 - (c) Attainment of research grants
 - (d) Receipt of research honors and awards
- (6) Research Support Activities
 - (a) Miscellaneous research support activities
 - (b) Reviewing for journals/conferences
- (7) Professional Development Activities Related to Research
- (8) External Review of Research Performance
- (9) Work under Review
- (10) Work in Progress

The members of the Committee give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline which relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. Further, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

The assessment of research quality involves substantial judgment on the part of the members of the Committee. Quality is difficult to assess, and involves consideration of the research itself, the channel in which the research is published, and the review process it has undergone. This process requires a careful examination and synthesis of information provided by the candidate regarding activities and publications in addition to knowledge of the quality of the publication outlet. It is therefore important that the candidate provide appropriate information regarding the quality of the journals in which publications have appeared, and information about the quality of the specific articles published by the candidate. In those instances in which the faculty member has performed research involving the scholarship of engagement, assessment from community members may also be considered to determine the level of impact of the research. The department must also obtain reviews from at least three external reviewers.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition

to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publication will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals and on the impact of a publication on the discipline such as the citation indexes compiled by the Google Scholar.

- **Excellent:** The research performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Excellent** if they; a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of more than one B level or above peer reviewed journal articles per year, among which four or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of research grant(s), research award(s), or other research related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Good:** The research performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Good** if they; (a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of one B level or above peer reviewed journal article per year, among which two or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of the successful attainment of research grant(s) and/or other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Fair:** The research performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Fair** if they; (a) demonstrate the ability to conduct quality research on average at the rate of one B level peer reviewed journal article per year; (b) supplement an acceptable research record with evidence of involvement in other activities listed in other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The research performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they; (a) have less than an average of one B level peer reviewed journal article per year; and (b) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** Candidates for tenure or promotion who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Service:

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline and to the external community evolves during the probationary period. While it is generally expected that candidates for tenure or promotion will have less service activity than more senior faculty members, evidence of interest and contributions in this area must be provided. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- (1) University Governance (not related to either research or teaching)
 - (a) Leadership positions
 - (b) Membership on College committees
 - (c) Membership on department committees
 - (d) Membership on University committees
 - (e) Other University governance activities
- (2) Professional Activities
 - (a) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the Local, regional, and national levels

- (b) Leadership positions in professional organizations
- (c) Membership in professional organizations
- (3) External Community Service and Engagement
 - (a) Unpaid professional service to public and private sector organizations
 - (b) Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
- (4) Service Recognition Awards
- (5) Other Service Activities
 - (a) Administrative assignments
 - (b) Advising student clubs, special projects/competitions
 - (c) Editorial boards
 - (d) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations

Please note that serving on editorial review boards may in certain situations, be considered as either research related activity or service related activity, depending on the nature of the work. Unless otherwise adequately explained by the candidate, service on editorial review boards will be considered service related activity and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the Committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of quantity and quality of service activities.

- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period; and (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Good:** The service performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period; and (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section VIII.4.A.4.)
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the probationary period; and (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support

activities for the bulk of the probationary period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period.

- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for tenure or promotion is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the Probationary Period.

B. Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor (Art. 14, sec. 6.4)

1. The following are guidelines for reaching an evaluative judgment on each of the three criteria of performance: teaching, research, and service. Following the process that the Department has approved, the candidate's performance will be evaluated based on the standards/expectations identified for the performance indicators included, as meeting one of the five following levels of performance: Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, or Clearly Unacceptable. The evaluation period will be the time since the appointment as Associate Professor (or service as a tenure track faculty member).

2. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching, Research, and Service

While teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carry more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates, promotion to full professor also requires demonstrated evidence of strong service records. Therefore, to be recommended or strongly recommended for promotion to Professor, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed one of the following:

- (1) Good in teaching, research, and service
- (2) Excellent in teaching, Fair or better in research, and good in service;
- (3) Excellent in research, Fair or better in teaching, and good in service;

No candidate who is evaluated as Marginally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable in any of the areas at the time the promotion decision is made may receive a positive recommendation. Further, no candidate who is evaluated as Fair in all three areas at the time the promotion decision is made may receive a positive recommendation.

3. Primary emphasis will be placed on the candidate's contributions since promotion to Associate Professor.
4. Promotion to Professor requires that the candidate be active and productive in all of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. As noted below, it is not possible to be promoted to Professor if the candidate is deficient in any one of these three areas. However, it is possible for a faculty member to continuously make strong contributions in only one or two of these areas and yet that candidate may not be judged acceptable for promotion.
5. University policy does not establish a minimum number of years of service at the Associate Professor level prior to promotion to Professor. However, the level and quality of contributions expected in the areas of teaching, research, and service would suggest that a period of time comparable to that spent working toward promotion to Associate Professor is typically desirable in order to achieve the record normally expected of a candidate for promotion to Professor. In unusual cases where candidates have achieved such a record in a 'shorter' period of time, then promotion

to Professor may be expected when that happens. Thus, the appropriate criterion will be whether the candidate has the necessary record rather than whether the candidate has been an Associate Professor long enough. Similarly, candidates for promotion to Professor should not be held to a higher standard for promotion simply because they have been Associate Professors longer than 'normal.' Again, the record of accomplishments is the determinant and not the time needed to achieve that record.

Teaching:

BGSU is committed to providing all of our students with a high educational experience, with faculty members providing an exceptional classroom learning experience and success in reaching the learning outcomes established. It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While the greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components will be used in judging the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, in addition to the required items of student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Regarding student evaluations, the overall course rating should be provided for each course taught, and the overall course rating of comparable courses (as identified by the department) from the same time period should be provided for comparative purposes. Assessment data and grade distributions for each course taught as well as the grade distributions for comparable courses should also be provided. Other items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

- (1) Classroom Teaching
 - (a) Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (required)
 - (b) Student evaluations of teaching (required)
 - (c) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching (required)
 - (d) Syllabi (required)
 - (e) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
 - (f) Documentation of student learning outcomes
 - (g) Teaching awards and distinctions
 - (h) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching
- (2) Non-classroom Teaching/Advising, e.g.,
 - (a) Advising students
 - (b) Guiding graduate thesis
 - (c) Teaching independent studies
 - (d) Teaching special studies
 - (e) Advising student clubs, special projects/competition
- (3) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
 - (a) Oversight of student activities related to service learning
 - (b) Efforts to incorporate external community problems and issues into the course content
 - (c) Provision of educational opportunities to the external community in the areas of financial planning, corporate finance, international finance, financial institutions, and/or investment advice
- (4) Teaching Support Activities, e.g.
 - (a) Course development
 - (b) Curriculum/program development

- (c) Participation on curriculum activities
- (d) Adoption of high impact teaching pedagogies
- (e) Innovative teaching methods development
- (f) Professional development related to teaching
- (g) Textbooks/instructional materials development
- (h) Contributions to departmental efforts to assess student achievement of program learning objectives

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of candidates' teaching performance. Please note that publishing case studies may, in certain situations, be considered as either teaching related activity or research related activity, depending on the material covered in those cases. Unless otherwise explained by the candidate, publishing case studies will be considered teaching related activity and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

Overall teaching records over the candidate's academic career (with emphasis on teaching performance at Bowling Green State University) are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period. Emphasis will be on the candidate's teaching record since promotion to Associate Professor.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The candidate's department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of candidates for promotion. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. These written evaluations will be provided to the candidate and the College P & T Committee by the department when the candidate comes up for promotion. The department will also provide written discussion of how these peer evaluations compare to other faculty of comparable rank and experience.

The successful candidate must have an established reputation as an effective teacher and this effectiveness must extend beyond classroom-related activities. In addition to traditional measures of effective classroom teaching (e.g. student and peer evaluations of the candidate's performance as a teacher), candidates should exhibit contributions in other areas such as curriculum and course development, mentoring of junior faculty on teaching related matters, and student recruitment and retention; all factors which create a learning environment that enables students and faculty to develop the knowledge, skills and capabilities needed for personal success, and which contribute to the academic vitality of the College and University.

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will have initiated teaching or teaching-related activities intended to benefit students and/or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting 'how to teach in my discipline' workshops, developing new curriculum for students in the candidate's discipline, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a 'teaching mentor', etc. The emphasis should not be on 'directing' others to achieve certain goals,

but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process. Effective classroom teaching, while not sufficient to obtain an Excellent evaluation of teaching performance, is necessary to receive an overall evaluation of Good.

- **Excellent:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.3 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the top quartile of all departmental ratings made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, regional or national recognition in student competitions, and leading roles in new program and/or course development are additional evidence of excellence in teaching.
- **Good:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Good** if they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 4.0 or above on a 5.0 scale or well above the department median made by their colleagues and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Fair:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Fair** if they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations that are 3.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or at the department median made by their colleagues and students; and (b) participate actively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development and scholarship of engagement activities.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations that are 2.5 or above on a 5.0 scale or below the department median made by their colleagues and their students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Research:

The Committee evaluates the candidate's research performance based on written records contained in the candidate's research portfolio. Candidates must demonstrate that they are recognized as experts in their research fields (e.g., journal article citations through Google Scholar) as well as evidence of an ongoing research program resulting in scholarly publications and presentations at scholarly meetings. Particular emphasis is placed upon publications and presentations juried by professional peers at the regional and national levels. The evaluation of research involves assessing both the quantity and quality of research activity and output. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates are based on the total research record, research performed and published while candidates are at BGSU generally is given primary emphasis. In addition, research

activity since promotion to Associate Professor will be given greater emphasis. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

- (1) Publications
 - (a) Books (non-textbooks)
 - (b) Journal articles
 - (c) Monographs
- (2) Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach, and engagement activities.
- (3) Presentations
 - (a) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
 - (b) Proceeding publications
- (4) Other Contributions
 - (a) Published book reviews
 - (b) Published cases
- (5) Research Recognition
 - (a) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
 - (b) Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
 - (c) Attainment of research grants
 - (d) Receipt of research honors and awards
- (6) Research Support Activities
 - (a) Miscellaneous research support activities
 - (b) Reviewing for journals/conferences
- (7) Professional Development Activities Related to Research

The members of the Committee give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline which relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. Further, the Committee recognizes the value of demonstrating sustained productivity in the candidates' research credentials. Hence, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

The assessment of research quality involves substantial judgment on the part of the members of the Committee. Quality is difficult to assess, and involves consideration of the research itself, the channel in which the research is published, and the review process it has undergone. This process requires a careful examination and synthesis of information provided by the candidate regarding activities and publications in addition to knowledge of the quality of the publication outlet. The candidate will provide appropriate information regarding the quality of the journals in which publications have appeared, and information about the quality of the specific articles published by the candidate. In those instances in which the faculty member has performed research involving the scholarship of engagement, assessment from community members may also be considered to determine the level of impact of the research. The department must also obtain reviews from at least three external reviewers.

Moreover, it is expected that candidates for promotion to Professor will have displayed the ability to take the initiative in research and/or research-related activities. This can be accomplished via solo publications, lead authorship in publications, organization and implementation of research symposia, mentoring of research activity of junior faculty, mentoring of research activity of students, etc. When dealing with colleagues and/or students, this does not imply that candidates 'directed' students and/or colleagues, but suggests that candidates have been able to work cooperatively with others in order to achieve mutual research goals.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publication will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals and on the impact of a publication on the discipline such as the citation indexes compiled by the Google Scholar.

- **Excellent:** The research performance of candidates for promotion to Professor since the last promotion is judged **Excellent** if they; a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of more than one B level or above peer reviewed journal articles per year, among which five or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of research grant(s), research award(s), or other research related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Good:** The research performance of candidates for promotion to Professor since the last promotion is judged **Good** if they; (a) provide evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research on average at the rate of one B level or above peer reviewed journal article per year, among which three or more are A level; (b) provide evidence of the successful attainment of research grant(s) and/or other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Fair:** The research performance of candidates for promotion to Professor since the last promotion is judged **Fair** if they; (a) demonstrate the ability to conduct quality research on average at the rate of one B level or above peer reviewed journal article per year, among which at least one is A level; (b) supplement an acceptable research record with evidence of involvement in other activities listed in other research-related activities; and (c) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The research performance of candidates for promotion to Professor since the last promotion is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they; (a) have less than an average of one B level peer reviewed journal article per year; and (b) exhibit evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** Candidates for promotion to Professor who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Service:

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, programs, and the mission of the department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to candidates' professions/disciplines evolves during a faculty member's academic career. It is generally expected that candidates for promotion to Professor will have made substantial contributions in the area of service. However, as with teaching and research, the candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to have assumed a leadership role in the area of service. Passive participation on a large number of committees will

not be considered adequate. Leadership is not interpreted to mean assuming administrative or supervisory roles, but rather is interpreted as pro-active, creative activity which is intended to achieve a common objective. The candidate will provide a portfolio of evidence regarding service activity during this time period relevant to the performance indicators listed below.

- (1) University Governance (not related to either research or teaching)
 - (a) Leadership positions
 - (b) Membership on College committees
 - (c) Membership on department committees
 - (d) Membership on University committees
 - (e) Other University governance activities
- (2) Professional Activities
 - (a) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the
 - (b) Local, regional, and national levels
 - (c) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (d) Membership in professional organizations
- (3) External Community Service and Engagement
 - (a) Unpaid professional service to public and private sector organizations
 - (b) Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
- (4) Service Recognition Awards
- (5) Other Service Activities
 - (a) Administrative assignments
 - (b) Advising student clubs, special projects/competitions
 - (c) Editorial boards
 - (d) Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations

Please note that serving on editorial review boards may in certain situations, be considered as either research related activity or service related activity, depending on the nature of the work. Unless otherwise adequately explained by the candidate, service on editorial review boards will be considered service related activity and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the Committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of quantity and quality of service activities. As already indicated for teaching and research, activity since promotion to Associate Professor will be given greater weight.

Successful candidates for promotion to professor will also have displayed at least moderate leadership abilities in their service activities. This may take the form of chairing committees, workshops, etc., but could also be accomplished by being influential and/or instrumental in working toward completion of the task assigned to a group of individuals.

- **Excellent:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the

bulk of the review period; (b) served on and held major office in at least one Department, College and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; (c) made outstanding contributions by holding major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, in community engagement, or in another service activity listed in (Section X.4.A.4.); and (d) display substantial leadership in performing service activities.

- **Good:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Good** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one Department, College, and University committees requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; (c) made a major contribution to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in community engagement or other service activity as listed in (Section X.4.A.4.); and (d) display leadership in performing service activities.
- **Fair:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Fair** if they: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period; (b) served on at least one department, College, or University committee requiring reasonable commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period; and (c) made a contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity, in community engagement, or other service activity as listed in (Section X.4.A.4).
- **Marginally Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they participated in departmental governance and support activities for the bulk of the review period, but did not serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitments of time and energy for the bulk of the review period.
- **Clearly Unacceptable:** The service performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they did not participate in departmental governance nor support activities for the bulk of the review period.

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

C. Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials


At the beginning of each academic year the timeline of Tenure and Promotion Review shall be set by the College and the Office of the Provost. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA. The process for soliciting external reviews of the candidate's research portfolio will also adhere to the procedures provided by the Provost's Office.


Tenure and Promotion Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials for the review period by the deadline. The relevant items to be evaluated are described in the appropriate sections of this document.

A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

- Student Evaluations
 - Peer Evaluations
 - Course Syllabi
 - Teaching Philosophy Statement
 - Program/Curriculum Development
 - Teaching Recognition Awards
- B. Evaluation of Research Performance
- Refereed and Non-Refereed Journal Articles
 - Scholarly Books, Book Chapters, and Book Reviews
 - Other Publications (e.g., Monographs)
 - Paper Presentations
 - Journal Editorship
 - Research Grants, Honors and Awards
 - Other Research-related Activities (e.g., journal article review, session chair, etc.)
 - Research Philosophy Statement
 - External Reviews on Research Performance (for EPR only)
- C. Evaluation of Service Performance
- University Governance Activities
 - Professional Activities
 - Service Recognition Awards

Approved by the School/Department of _____ Department of Finance _____

Chair/Director  Date 02/28/2019

Reviewed by the Dean  Date 5/1/19

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

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost  Date 4/30/19

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