Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy

Part II: School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies (HMSLS) Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies (HMSLS)

Table of Contents

Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Annual Performance Review (APR), Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), and Promotion Review (PR)

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) Annual Performance Review (APR), Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), and Promotion Review (PR)

Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) Annual Performance Review (APR),
Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), and Promotion Review (PR)

I. **Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APR and EPR of NTTF in Years One-Six**
The purpose of this section is to document content, criteria, and standards to be used by all reviewers during annual performance reviews (APR) and enhanced performance reviews (EPR) for non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) during years one through six of their appointment at one of the three NTTF ranks (i.e., instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer). All non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) regardless of rank shall have earned a minimum of a master's degree in a content area appropriate to the academic program of the appointment. All credentials should be error-free and prepared to professional, academic standards.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
All non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are responsible for performing effective teaching and learning activities. All NTTF shall demonstrate effective teaching and support of student learning during the review period as evidenced by at least 51% of courses being evaluated as 3.0 or greater on 5 point scale, and at least two other indicators of teaching effectiveness. Additionally, during Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) years, at least two (2) peer-review from a faculty member above candidate's current rank must be provided in the portfolio.

A. **Content Documentation – Teaching Portfolio**
High-quality instruction, which encompasses student engagement and focused instruction of learning objectives is a principal component of all faculty members' record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are subsequently specified. Documentation of teaching effectiveness shall take the form of a teaching narrative of no more than five (5) pages incorporating a philosophy of teaching. In addition to the narrative, up to five teaching artifacts, listed below. The narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward teaching effectiveness.

Required success indicators address the quality of instructional practices provided to undergraduate students (and if appropriate, graduate students) and the degree to which they facilitate student learning. They include: 1) Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs); 2) student qualitative evaluations of instruction (written comments) must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) and indicate that the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum; 3) at least one peer-evaluation of teaching during the review period. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive; 4) selected course syllabus submitted in accordance with CBA required elements.

In addition to what is required above, the following three domains are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate Courses)**
2. **Instructional and Curricular Development**
3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for effective teaching and learning include the following:

1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate):** This domain demonstrates how effectively resources are deployed to support teaching in relation to promoting active student engagement and learning.

Example Indicators: documentation of student learning outcomes; self-evaluations of courses taught; advising/supervision of Masters students (i.e., major advisor (if have Grad Faculty status), committee member, second reader); teaching awards and distinctions.

2. **Instructional and Curricular Development:** This domain focuses on contributions to course and program curricular development as well as individual professional development efforts devoted to enhancing one's own teaching effectiveness (e.g., in relationship to active student learning and engagement).
Example Indicators: instructional innovations; development of new courses; significant revision of existing courses; contributions to revising or developing program curriculum; course revisions based on program evaluation or revised accreditation standards; development of assessment plans for evaluating student learning outcomes; professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; supervision of independent studies offered to students.

3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning:** This domain consists of a variety of contributions to student learning that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction including those associated with pedagogies of engagement such as undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, and the use or development of instructional technologies.
Example Indicators: Commitment to and provision of academic advising services for students; guidance of students in service learning, clinical setting, internships, & co-operative work experiences; efforts to extend teaching beyond the classroom through pedagogies of engagement such as supervising undergraduate research and honors theses or leading study abroad groups; participation in University, College, or School projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective active, engaged learning.

SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS

All non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are responsible for participation in effective academic service activities. All NTTF shall provide service during the review period as evidenced by membership on at least one committee or other service task to their program and/or the School, the College of EDHD and/or the University, as well as membership in local, state, and/or regional professional organizations or activities.

A. **Content Documentation – Service Effectiveness Portfolio**
Documentation of service effectiveness shall take the form of a service narrative of no more than five pages supported by up to five service artifacts from the domains listed below. The service narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward service effectiveness.

1. **Program and School Service**
2. **College and University Service**
3. **Professional Service** - Voluntary activities drawing on professional expertise
4. **Other Service Contributions** - May have N/A in this category.
5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities** - Responsibilities for which 1 or more credit hours of administrative load are assigned by the school director and approved by the Dean (e.g., program coordinator, field experience coordinator, lab coordinator, accreditation leader).

Examples of support data used as performance indicators for service:

1. **Program and School Service:** This domain refers to participation in Program and/or School Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams) that support the academic and student affairs of the academic program or School of HMSLS. [Note: it is expected that NTTF ensure that all program-level service/committee responsibilities are addressed before participating in School-level service.]

Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number and time commitment of leadership for committee/council positions; other activities that support academic/student activities of the Program/School.

2. **College and University Service:** This domain refers to participation in College and/or University Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams) that support the academic and student affairs of BGSU.
Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number of and time commitment of leadership committee/council positions.

3. **Professional Service:** This service domain refers to contributions to one's academic profession. [Note: This domain does not include paid consultantships or honoraria.]
Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment of leadership on committee/council, workshops, conferences at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment to manuscript reviews, or editorial boards.

4. **Other Service Contributions:** This service domain refers to drawing upon one's professional/ academic scholarly expertise for the benefit of the public and community partners through voluntary, unremunerated activities.
Performance Indicators: Community service using professional expertise; applying scholarship/creative works to promote community activities, or community service awards, etc.

5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities:** This domain refers to any administrative activities provided by members of the Collective Bargaining Unit (e.g., undergraduate and graduate program coordinator, field experience, co-op, or clinical coordinator; lab coordinator)
Performance Indicators: Scope and importance of assignment (e.g., size of program, number of constituents served; documented evidence of service contributions).

II. School of HMSLS Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

A. The School Personnel Committee, composed of voting-eligible faculty, will review each NTTF candidate's credentials annually (APR). The NTTF faculty member's credentials should include:
1. A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae in the prescribed University format,
2. A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the review period,
3. Teaching and service portfolios representing the NTTF faculty member's workload assignment for the previous year.
4. Quantitative and qualitative (written comments) student evaluations of instruction (SEI) for two courses taught during the previous two semesters,
5. Representative syllabi for two courses taught in the previous year that include all components required by the CBA.
6. The previous APR from each level of review from the previous years review.

B. Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPR) (completed every three years) shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following supporting materials:
1. A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (CV) in the prescribed University format,
2. A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the three-year review period,
3. Teaching and service portfolios representing the NTTF faculty member's workload assignment for the previous three years.
4. Quantitative and qualitative (written comments) student evaluations of instruction (SEI) for four courses taught during the previous six semesters,
5. Representative syllabi for three courses taught in the previous three years that include all components required by the CBA.

6. The evaluative memoranda (previous APR's) from each level of review for the review period.

III. School of HMSLS Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

A. Membership of the School Personnel Review Committee (PRC) shall include five elected committee members who comprise the main organizing committee.
   1. Elected PRC members will be faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate in the School. When reviewing non-tenure-track faculty for Annual Performance Reviews (APR), faculty eligible to vote may provide electronic or verbal feedback to the PRC for consideration during their deliberations.
   2. Whenever possible, there will be no more than two representatives on the elected PRC from any one program.
   3. The School Director conducts an election for the five committee members at the end of each AY, if possible. All BUFM shall be eligible to vote for members of the Personnel Review Committee.
   4. Committee members shall be elected for a three-year term, which will be staggered to assure continuity.
   5. Committee members will select a Chair.
   6. A School committee member being reviewed shall not participate in the discussion nor vote on their own review.
   7. The School Director is an *ex-officio* member without voting privileges and may not participate in the deliberations concerning personnel.
   8. Responsibilities of the PRC Chair
      a. Responsible for conducting meetings, communicating with appropriate faculty, and seeking official interpretation of policy for members of the committee.
      b. Responsible for making recommendations for changes in School procedures to the Director.
      c. Shall deliver the Committee's evaluative memorandum to the School Director.
      d. Responsible for uploading the evaluative memorandum to the electronic portfolio and for recording the faculty vote in EPR and promotion decisions.
   9. The School of HMSLS Personnel Review Committee members shall:
      a. independently review the candidate's credentials during a specified time period;
      b. meet as a committee of the whole with eligible faculty to discuss whether a candidate has met or exceeded the criteria performance standards;
      c. formally vote on the candidate relative to reappointment (EPR only) or promotion; and
      d. write a formal memorandum of evaluation to the Director.

B. PRC review for annual performance reviews (APR)
   1. Members of the School PRC review the candidate's credentials and attend a meeting to discuss the candidate's credentials and progress. They will invite written comments from other HMSLS faculty to be included in the discussions.
   2. No vote is taken or recorded.
   3. PRC members will compose a review letter to the School Director evaluating the candidate's progress towards annual reappointment (APR).

IV. School of HMSLS Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

The purpose of this section is to document content, criteria, and standards to be used by all reviewers during promotion reviews for non-tenure track faculty (NTTF).

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
All non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are responsible for performing effective teaching and learning activities. All NTTF shall demonstrate effective teaching and support of student learning during the review period.

A. **Content Documentation – Teaching Portfolio**
High-quality instruction, which encompasses student engagement and focused instruction of learning objectives is a principal component of all faculty members' record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are subsequently specified. Documentation of teaching effectiveness shall take the form of a teaching narrative of no more than five (5) pages incorporating a philosophy of teaching. In addition to the narrative, up to five teaching artifacts, listed below. The narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward teaching effectiveness.

Required Artifacts: The success indicators address the quality of instructional practices provided to undergraduate students (and if appropriate, graduate students) and the degree to which they facilitate student learning. They include: 1) Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs); 2) student qualitative evaluations of instruction (written comments) must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) and indicate that the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum; 3) at least one peer-evaluation of teaching during the review period. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive; 4) selected course syllabus submitted in accordance with CBA required elements.

In addition to what is required above, the following three domains are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate Courses)**
2. **Instructional and Curricular Development**
3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for effective teaching and learning include the following:

1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate):** This domain demonstrates how effectively resources are deployed to support teaching in relation to promoting active student engagement and learning.
    Example Indicators: documentation of student learning outcomes; self-evaluations of courses taught; advising/supervision of Masters students (i.e., major advisor (if have Grad Faculty status), committee member, second reader); teaching awards and distinctions.

2. **Instructional and Curricular Development:** This domain focuses on contributions to course and program curricular development as well as individual professional development efforts devoted to enhancing one's own teaching effectiveness (e.g., in relationship to active student learning and engagement).
    Example Indicators: instructional innovations; development of new courses; significant revision of existing courses; contributions to revising or developing program curriculum; course revisions based on program evaluation or revised accreditation standards; development of assessment plans for evaluating student learning outcomes; professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; supervision of independent studies offered to students.

3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning:** This domain consists of a variety of contributions to student learning that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction including those associated with pedagogies of engagement such as undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, and the use or development of instructional technologies.
    Example Indicators: Commitment to and provision of academic advising services for students; guidance of students in service learning, clinical setting, internships, & co-operative work experiences; efforts to extend teaching beyond the classroom through pedagogies of engagement

such as supervising undergraduate research and honors theses or leading study abroad groups; participation in University, College, or School projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective active, engaged learning.

B. **Teaching Effectiveness Standards for Promotion by Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)**
   HMSLS faculty provide the information below as *minimum requirements*. We intend this information to guide NTTF faculty as they aspire to promotion to the next rank.

Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Teaching Effectiveness: Instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching and promoting student learning. We include student academic mentoring/advising within the teaching section of the portfolio. Teaching effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion to lecturer, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-c below.

(a) A teaching narrative that details the way that the artifacts reflect how the candidate has met the standards of teaching effectiveness as well as describes how evaluations from students, peers, and self have informed the candidate's teaching practices and philosophy. The narrative should explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APR and EPR's, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document 51% of the SEI's are 3.2 or greater.

(c) A minimum of two (2) positive peer-evaluations from within the review period from a colleague within the College above the rank of the candidate. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive.

(d) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught per year during the review period. Student comments should not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom.

(e) Syllabi for two courses taught in the previous two semesters to illustrate compliance with CBA syllabus requirements and contributions to student learning.

(f) Other evidence of effective teaching as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Teaching Effectiveness: Highly effective instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching and promoting student learning. We include student academic mentoring/ advising within the teaching section of the portfolio. Teaching effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion to Senior Lecturer, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-c below.

(a) A teaching narrative that details the way that the artifacts reflect how the candidate has met the standards of teaching effectiveness, provided leadership in teaching, as well as describes how evaluations from students, peers, and self have informed the candidate's teaching practices and philosophy. The narrative should explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APR and EPR's, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document 51% of the SEI's are 3.5 or greater.

(c) A minimum of three (3) positive peer-evaluations from within the review period from a colleague within the unit above the rank of the candidate. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive.

(d) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught per year during the review period. Student comments should not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom.

(e) Syllabi for two courses taught in the previous two semesters to illustrate compliance with CBA syllabus requirements and contributions to student learning.

(f) Other evidence of effective teaching as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.

SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS

All non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are responsible for participation in effective academic service activities. All NTTF shall provide service during the review period as evidenced by the criteria listed below.

A. Content Documentation – Service Effectiveness Portfolio

Documentation of service effectiveness shall take the form of a service narrative of no more than five pages supported by up to five service artifacts from the domains listed below. The service narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward service effectiveness.

There are five major domains for service effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Program and School Service**
2. **College and University Service**
3. **Professional Service** - Voluntary activities drawing on professional expertise
4. **Other Service Contributions** - May have N/A in this category.
5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities** - Responsibilities for which 1 or more credit hours of administrative load are assigned (e.g., program coordinator, field experience coordinator, lab coordinator, accreditation leader)

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators:
1. **Program and School Service:** This domain refers to participation in Program and/or School Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams). [Note: it is expected that NTTF ensure that all program-level service/committee responsibilities are addressed before participating in School-level service.]
Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number and time commitment of leadership for committee/council positions; other activities that support academic/student activities of the Program/School.

2. **College and University Service:** This domain refers to participation in College and/or University Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams). Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number of and time commitment of leadership committee/council positions.

3. **Professional Service:** This service domain refers to contributions to one's academic profession. [Note: This domain does not include paid consultantships or honoraria.]
Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment of leadership on committee/council, workshops, conferences at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment to manuscript reviews, or editorial boards.

4. **Other Service Contributions:** This service domain refers to drawing upon one's professional/ academic scholarly expertise for the benefit of the public and community partners through voluntary, unremunerated activities.
Performance Indicators: Community service using professional expertise; applying scholarship/creative works to promote community activities, or community service awards, etc.

5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities:** This domain refers to any administrative activities provided by members of the Collective Bargaining Unit (e.g., undergraduate and graduate program coordinator, field experience, co-op, or clinical coordinator; lab coordinator) Performance Indicators: Scope and importance of assignment (e.g., size of program, number of constituents served; documented evidence of service contributions).

B. Service Effectiveness Standards for Promotion by NTTF

HMSLS faculty have provided the information below as *minimum requirements*. We intend this information to guide NTTF faculty as they aspire to promotion to the next rank.

Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Service Effectiveness: High quality service performance is a principle component of a faculty member's record. Service activities must have occurred during the review period (i.e., since hire at BGSU). Service effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-c below.

(a) Participation in at least one (1) recruitment and retention activity at the Programs and/or School level.

(b) Serving on an average of at least one committee at the Program and/or School levels per year for the period under review.

(c) The candidate should be involved in or able demonstrate pursuit of involvement in one professional organization related to an area of expertise at the state, regional or national level.

(d) Other evidence of service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Service Effectiveness: High quality service performance is a principle component of a faculty member's record. Services activities must have occurred during the review period (i.e., since promotion to Lecturer). Leadership in some service activities is particularly desirable. Service effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-c below.

(a) Participation in at least one (1) recruitment and retention activity at the Programs and/or School level.

(b) Serving on an average of at least one (1) committee at the Program and/or School, College, and/or University levels for the period under review. Note: this requires at least two committee appointments, one (1) at the Program and/or School; and a second one (1) at the College and/or University level.

(c) Service to at least one professional organization related to an area of expertise at the regional or national level.

(d) Other evidence of service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

V. School of HMSLS Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

A. A NTTF candidate for promotion to the next NTTF rank must present teaching and service effectiveness portfolios with a minimum of three performance indicators (e.g., including required

Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI); peer-evaluations of teaching; and instructional resource materials in the domain of teaching effectiveness to a maximum of five total performance indicators. All credentials should be error-free and prepared to professional, academic standards.

1. The four domains are not necessarily meant to serve as the organizing scheme for the teaching portfolio. Pertinent information in the design and preparation of a teaching portfolio can be obtained from the School Director.

B. The School Personnel Committee will review each NTTF candidate's promotion credentials. The credentials should include:
   1. A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae in the required University format,
   2. The evaluative memoranda from all previous reviews,
   3. A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the review period,
   4. Appropriate portfolio(s) representing the NTTF faculty member's workload assignments (i.e., teaching effectiveness and service effectiveness),
   5. Summary of student qualitative and quantitative evaluations of instruction (SEI) for each course by semester for the three (3) years immediately preceding promotion review,
   6. Peer-evaluations of instruction,
   7. Representative syllabi for two courses taught in the previous two semesters to illustrate compliance with CBA syllabus requirements and contributions to student learning.

C. Review of each candidate's credentials shall consist of examining submitted materials in relation to School, College, and University promotion guidelines. Candidates with records established previously at other universities as identified in appointment letter will have their total records considered for promotion in rank. Their records at BGSU are evaluated for a pattern of continued productivity. Promotion is typically based on the NTTF faculty member's entire professional record with emphasis on the areas of workload allocation (i.e., normally teaching effectiveness and service effectiveness) since original appointment or the last promotion (regardless of the time duration of appointment at BGSU).

TTF (Tenure Track Faculty) Annual Performance Review (APR), Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), and Promotion Review (PR)

I. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APR and EPR of TTF

The purpose of this section is to document content, criteria, and standards to be used by the School of HMSLS PRC and faculty during annual performance reviews (APR) for years 1, 2, 4, and 5 and the enhanced performance review (EPR or third year review) for probationary tenure track faculty (TTF) during their appointment as an Assistant Professor. All credentials should be error-free and prepared to professional, academic standards. Each year, faculty should be making progress toward meeting the expectations for EPR and promotion to the next rank.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for promoting effective teaching and learning activities. TTF shall demonstrate effective teaching and support of student learning during the review period as evidenced by at least 51% of courses being evaluated as 3.0 or greater on 5 point scale and at least two other indicators of teaching effectiveness. Note: It is expected faculty are making progress toward promotion requirement of SEI's of 3.2 for at least 51% of courses; Additionally, during Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) years, at least two (2) peer-evaluations from a faculty member above candidate's current rank, from within the same College, must be provided.

A. Content Documentation – Teaching Portfolio

High-quality instruction, which encompasses student engagement and focused instruction of learning objectives is a principal component of all faculty members' record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are subsequently specified. Documentation of teaching effectiveness shall take the form of a teaching narrative of no more than five (5) pages incorporating a philosophy of teaching. In addition to the narrative, up to five teaching artifacts, listed below. The narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward teaching effectiveness.

Required Artifacts: The success indicators address the quality of instructional practices provided to undergraduate students (and if appropriate, graduate students) and the degree to which they facilitate student learning. They include: 1) Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs); 2) student qualitative evaluations of instruction (written comments) must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) and indicate that the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum; 3) at least one peer-evaluation of teaching during the review period. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive; 4) selected course syllabus submitted in accordance with CBA required elements.

In addition to what is required above, the following three domains are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate Courses)**
2. **Instructional and Curricular Development**
3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for effective teaching and learning include the following:

1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate):** This domain demonstrates how effectively resources are deployed to support teaching in relation to promoting active student engagement and learning.

Example Indicators: documentation of student learning outcomes; self-evaluations of courses taught; advising/supervision of Masters students (i.e., major advisor (if have Grad Faculty status), committee member, second reader); teaching awards and distinctions.

2. **Instructional and Curricular Development:** This domain focuses on contributions to course and program curricular development as well as individual professional development efforts devoted to enhancing one's own teaching effectiveness (e.g., in relationship to active student learning and engagement).
Example Indicators: instructional innovations; development of new courses; significant revision of existing courses; contributions to revising or developing program curriculum; course revisions based on program evaluation or revised accreditation standards; development of assessment plans for evaluating student learning outcomes; professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; supervision of independent studies offered to students.

3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning:** This domain consists of a variety of contributions to student learning that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction including those associated with pedagogies of engagement such as undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, and the use or development of instructional technologies.
Example Indicators: Commitment to and provision of academic advising services for students; guidance of students in service learning, clinical setting, internships, & co-operative work experiences; efforts to extend teaching beyond the classroom through pedagogies of engagement such as supervising undergraduate research and honors theses or leading study abroad groups; participation in University, College, or School projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective active, engaged learning.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK PRODUCTIVITY

All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for maintaining a line of scholarly research or creative activity. TTF shall demonstrate research productivity in a line of inquiry during the review period as evidenced by an average of at least one (1) peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional work (or a designated equivalent, e.g., grant submissions, book chapters, etc.) per year; and, on average, one (1) peer-reviewed presentation per year during the review period and/or other equivalent scholarly contributions to their discipline. During Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) candidates should have at least two (2) scholarly publications during the review period as well as at least one (1) peer-reviewed presentation or designated equivalent.

A. **Content Documentation – Research/Creative Work Portfolio**
The research/creative work productivity is demonstrated through a research portfolio including a research narrative not longer than five pages explaining how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the criteria for scholarly effectiveness and up to five research/creative work artifacts. The quality of research/creative work productivity is defined by the profession and is verified by a process of internal and external peer reviews. Documentation of research/creative work productivity shall provide evidence of a focused agenda for research/creative work inquiry, contributions to the knowledge base and/or creative practice of one's discipline.

The following domains are used to evaluate research/creative work effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Peer-reviewed research**
2. **Conference Presentations or other scholarly dissemination**
3. **Grant activity to support research or creative work**
4. **Reputation within the discipline**
5. **Other scholarly indicators**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for scholarship in research/creative work productivity include the following:

1. **Peer-reviewed research:** This research/creative/scholarly work domain refers to the primary products of a faculty member's line of research/creative work.
   Example Indicators: Peer-reviewed articles in high quality journals (or in-press); authored book(s); authored book chapter(s); editor of a book.

2. **Conference Presentations or other scholarly dissemination:** This domain refers to peer-reviewed dissemination of research or other scholarly work.
   Example Indicators: peer-reviewed presentations; workshop/seminar presenter based on expertise; manuscripts under revision, invited presentations.

3. **Grant activity to support research or creative work:** This domain refers to extramural support as validation of one's research/creative/scholarly work.
   Example Indicators: Major and/or minor external funding awards (major awards are at least $5,000); submission of a major and/or minor external funding proposal (effort for unfunded submissions is recognized, but cannot be used as a substitute for funded awards); and internal funding awards.

4. **Reputation within the Discipline**: This domain within research/creative work productivity refers to the scholarly reputation of faculty member generally held by-the members of one's field and, reputation and value of the work to the field.
   Example Indicators: Scholarly reputation of individual; reputation and value of the work to the field as evidenced by invited papers, invited presentations, editorials, keynotes, editorships, invited peer-reviews, visiting appointments, citations, external review letters, etc.

5. **Other scholarly indicators.** This domain refers to scholarship that may not be traditionally evaluated and includes scholarly or creative work that an individual candidate engages in outside of the university. This type of scholarship does not substitute for peer-reviewed publications.
   Example Indicators: Non-peer reviewed professional papers; non-peer reviewed professional presentations, consultancies, or institutional outreach.

SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS

All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for participation in academic service activities. TTF shall provide service during the review period as evidenced by participation on committees at the program and/or the School of HMSLS plus involvement at the College of EDHD and/or University levels as well as membership in one or more professional organization or activity at a local, regional or national level. During Enhanced Performance Review it is expected candidates will have served on at least two (2) committees at the Program and/or School levels; and provide evidence of service involvement at one of the other levels (e.g., the College, University, and/or professional).

A. **Content Documentation – Service Effectiveness Portfolio**
   Documentation of service effectiveness shall take the form of a service portfolio of no more than five pages.

   There are five major domains for service effectiveness and are noted in more detail below:
   1. **Program and School Service**
   2. **College and University Service**
   3. **Professional Service** - Voluntary activities drawing on professional expertise
   4. **Other service contributions** - May have N/A in this category.
   5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities** - Responsibilities for which 1 or more credit hours of administrative load is (are) assigned (e.g., program coordinator, field experience coordinator, lab coordinator, accreditation leader).

   Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for service:

1. **Program and School Service:** This domain refers to participation in Program and/or School Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams, unit recruitment/retention activities) that support the academic and student affairs of the academic program or School of HMSLS. [Note: it is expected that TTF ensure that all program-level service/committee responsibilities are addressed before participating in School-level service.] Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number and time commitment of leadership for committee/council positions; other activities that support academic/student activities of the Program/School.

2. **College and University Service:** This domain refers to participation in College and/or University Committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams) that support the academic and student affairs of BGSU. Example Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number of and time commitment of leadership committee/council positions.

3. **Professional Service:** This service domain refers to contributions to one's academic profession. [Note: This domain does not include paid consultantships or honoraria.] Example Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment of leadership on committee/council, workshops, conferences at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment to manuscript reviews, or editorial boards.

4. **Other Service Contributions:** This service domain refers to drawing upon one's professional/academic scholarly expertise for the benefit of the public and community partners through voluntary, unremunerated activities. Example Indicators: Community service using professional expertise; applying scholarship/creative works to promote community activities, or community service awards, etc.

5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities:** This domain refers to any administrative activities provided by members of the Collective Bargaining Unit (e.g., undergraduate and graduate program coordinator, field experience, co-op, or clinical coordinator; lab coordinator) Example Indicators: Scope and importance of assignment (e.g., size of program, number of constituents served; documented evidence of service contributions).

II. School of HMSLS Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

A. The School Personnel Committee, composed of eligible voting faculty, will review each TTF candidate's credentials annually (APR). The TTF faculty member's credentials should include:
1. A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (CV) in the prescribed University format,
2. A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the review period,
3. Teaching, research, and service portfolios representing the TTF faculty member's workload assignment (e.g., 50% teaching, 30% research, 20% service are customary for TTF although other allocations maybe assigned) for the previous year.
4. Summary of student evaluations of instruction (SEI) (both qualitative written comments and quantitative scores) for each course taught during the previous year,
5. Representative syllabi for two courses taught in the previous year that include all four components required by the CBA,
6. The evaluative memoranda from each level of review from the previous year's review.

B. Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPR) shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of the following supporting materials:
1. A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae (CV) in the prescribed University format,
2. A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the three-year review period,

3. Appropriate portfolios representing the TTF faculty member's workload assignment (e.g., 50% teaching, 30% research, 20% service are customary for TTF although other allocations maybe assigned) documenting performance during the prior three years.
4. Summary of student evaluations of instruction (SEI) (both qualitative written comments and quantitative scores) for each course taught during the review period,
5. Representative syllabi for three courses taught in the review period that include all components required by the CBA.
6. The evaluative memoranda from each level of review for the review period.
7. Review of each candidate's credentials shall include years of service agreed to by Dean and candidate in hiring contract.

III. School of HMSLS Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

A. Membership of the School Personnel Review Committee (PRC) shall include five elected committee members who comprise the main organizing committee.
1. Elected PRC members will be faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate in the School. When reviewing non-tenure-track faculty for Annual Performance Reviews (APR), faculty eligible to vote may provide electronic or verbal feedback to the PRC for consideration during their deliberations.
2. Whenever possible, there will be no more than two representatives on the elected PRC from any one program.
3. The School Director conducts an election for the five committee members at the end of each AY, if possible. All BUFM shall be eligible to vote for members of the Personnel Review Committee.
4. Committee members shall be elected for a three-year term, which will be staggered to assure continuity.
5. Committee members will select a Chair.
6. A School committee member being reviewed shall not participate in the discussion nor vote on their own review.
7. The School Director is an *ex-officio* member without voting privileges and may not participate in the deliberations concerning personnel.
8. Responsibilities of the PRC Chair
   a. Responsible for conducting meetings, communicating with appropriate faculty, and seeking official interpretation of policy for members of the committee.
   b. Responsible for making recommendations for changes in School procedures to the Director.
   c. Shall deliver the Committee's evaluative memorandum to the School Director.
   d. Responsible for uploading the evaluative memorandum to the electronic portfolio and for recording the faculty vote in EPR and promotion decisions.
9. The School of HMSLS Personnel Review Committee members shall:
   a. independently review the candidate's credentials during a specified time period;
   b. meet as a committee of the whole with eligible faculty to discuss whether a candidate has met or exceeded the criteria performance standards;
   c. formally vote on the candidate relative to reappointment (EPR only) or promotion; and
   d. write a formal memorandum of evaluation to the Director.

B. PRC review for annual performance reviews (APR)
1. Members of the School PRC review the candidate's credentials and attend a meeting to discuss the candidate's credentials and progress. They will invite written comments from other HMSLS faculty to be included in the discussions.
2. No vote is taken or recorded.
3. PRC members will compose a review letter to the School Director evaluating the candidate's progress towards annual reappointment (APR).

IV. School of HMSLS Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

The purpose of this section is to document criteria and standards to be used by all reviewers during reviews for tenure and promotion for probationary tenure-track faculty (TTF).

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for promoting effective teaching and learning activities. All TTF shall demonstrate effective teaching and support of student learning during the review period.

A. Content Documentation – Teaching Portfolio
High-quality instruction, which encompasses student engagement and focused instruction of learning objectives is a principal component of all faculty members' record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are subsequently specified. Documentation of teaching effectiveness shall take the form of a teaching narrative of no more than five (5) pages incorporating a philosophy of teaching. In addition to the narrative, up to five teaching artifacts, listed below. The narrative must address the specific artifacts that the faculty member has selected to include and discuss how those artifacts contribute toward teaching effectiveness.

Required Artifacts: The success indicators address the quality of instructional practices provided to undergraduate students (and if appropriate, graduate students) and the degree to which they facilitate student learning. They include: 1) Student evaluations of instruction (SEIs); 2) student qualitative evaluations of instruction (written comments) must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) and indicate that the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum; 3) at least one peer-evaluation of teaching during the review period. Peer-evaluations that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive; 4) selected course syllabus submitted in accordance with CBA required elements.

In addition to what is required above, the following three domains are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate Courses)**
2. **Instructional and Curricular Development**
3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for effective teaching and learning include the following:

1. **Teaching Indicators (Undergraduate and Graduate):** This domain demonstrates how effectively resources are deployed to support teaching in relation to promoting active student engagement and learning.
   Example Indicators: documentation of student learning outcomes; self-evaluations of courses taught; advising/supervision of Masters students (i.e., major advisor (if have Grad Faculty status), committee member, second reader); teaching awards and distinctions.

2. **Instructional and Curricular Development:** This domain focuses on contributions to course and program curricular development as well as individual professional development efforts devoted to enhancing one's own teaching effectiveness (e.g., in relationship to active student learning and engagement).
   Example Indicators: instructional innovations; development of new courses; significant revision of existing courses; contributions to revising or developing program curriculum; course revisions based on program evaluation or revised accreditation standards; development of assessment plans for evaluating student learning outcomes; professional

development activities to enhance teaching skills; supervision of independent studies offered to students.

3. **Other Contributions to Student Learning:** This domain consists of a variety of contributions to student learning that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction including those associated with pedagogies of engagement such as undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, and the use or development of instructional technologies.
   Example Indicators: Commitment to and provision of academic advising services for students; guidance of students in service learning, clinical setting, internships, & co-operative work experiences; efforts to extend teaching beyond the classroom through pedagogies of engagement such as supervising undergraduate research and honors theses or leading study abroad groups; participation in University, College, or School projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective active, engaged learning.

B. **Teaching Effectiveness Standards for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF)**
   HMSLS faculty have provided the information below as *minimum requirements*. We intend this information to guide TTF faculty as they aspire to tenure and promotion to the next rank. Due to the varying nature and expectations of programs, faculty need to provide other artifacts as appropriate to their individual portfolio and clearly explain the artifacts in their narratives.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Teaching Effectiveness: Effective instruction is a primary expectation of a faculty member's record of teaching who applies for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Advising is to be included in the teaching section of the portfolio. Teaching effectiveness areas are specified below. For tenure and promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d below, and one from f-h.

(a) A teaching narrative that details the way that the required and selected artifacts reflect how the candidate has met the standards of teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy. The narrative should explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APR and EPR's, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document 51% of the SEI's are at least 3.2 (on a 5.0 scale).

(c) A minimum of two (2) peer teaching evaluations within the review period, with at least one (1) peer-teaching evaluation within the academic year immediately prior to promotion review from an individual within the College who is above the candidate's rank. Reviews must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns). The candidate must submit all reviews performed during the review period.

(d) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught per year during the review period. Student comments should not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or School Director.

(h) Other evidence of teaching and contributions to student learning as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion in rank for tenured faculty members is based upon performance and requires a cumulative record of sustained performance. Any faculty member may perform satisfactorily at the Associate level without necessarily warranting promotion to Full Professor. It also is recognized that a period of time shall elapse after a promotion to Associate, during which time further promotion is not normally to be expected. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost's office.

Teaching Effectiveness: Highly effective instruction is a primary expectation of a faculty member's record of teaching who applies for promotion to Professor. Advising is to be included in the teaching section of the portfolio. Teaching effectiveness areas are specified below. If the period since promotion to Associate Professor exceeds six (6) years, the most recent six (6) years will be considered or the candidate must document, in the teaching narrative, an explanation that precluded the inclusion of teaching scores. For tenure and promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d below, and one from f-h.

(a) A teaching narrative that details the way that the required and selected artifacts reflect how the candidate has met the standards of teaching effectiveness, provided leadership in teaching, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy. The narrative should explicitly address any concerns expressed in previous APR and EPR's, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document 51% of the SEI's are at least 3.5 (on a 5.0 scale).

(c) A minimum of two (2) peer teaching evaluations within the review period, with at least one (1) peer-teaching evaluation within the academic year immediately prior to promotion review from an individual within the College who is above the candidate's rank. Peer-evaluations must be deemed as generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns). The candidate must submit all reviews performed during the review period.

(d) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught per year during the review period. Student comments should not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by generally positive advisee evaluations, or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or School Director.

(h) Other evidence of teaching and contributions to student learning as appropriate and explained in the teaching narrative.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK PRODUCTIVITY
All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for maintaining a line of scholarly research or creative activity.

A. Content Documentation – Research Portfolio
The research/creative work productivity is demonstrated through a research portfolio including a research narrative not longer than five pages explaining how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the criteria for scholarly effectiveness and up to five research/creative work artifacts. The quality of research/creative work productivity is defined by the profession and is verified by a process of internal and external peer reviews. Documentation of

research/ creative work productivity shall provide evidence of a focused agenda for research/creative work inquiry, contributions to the knowledge base and/or creative practice of one's discipline.

Four domains will be used to evaluate research/creative work and are noted below:
1. **Peer-reviewed research**
2. **Conference presentations and other scholarly dissemination**
3. **Grant activity to support research or creative work**
4. **Reputation within the discipline**
5. **Other scholarly indicators**

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for scholarship in research/creative work productivity include the following:
1. **Peer-reviewed research and scholarly dissemination:** This research/creative/scholarly work domain refers to the primary products of a faculty member's line of research/creative work. Performance Indicators: Peer-reviewed articles in high quality journals (or in-press); authored book(s); authored book chapter(s); editor of a book.

2. **Conference Presentations or other scholarly dissemination:** This domain refers to peer-reviewed dissemination of research or other scholarly work. Example Indicators: peer-reviewed presentations; workshop/seminar presenter based on expertise; manuscripts under revision, invited presentations.

3. **Grant activity to support research/creative/scholarly work:** Domain refers to extramural support as validation of one's research/creative/scholarly work. Example Indicators: Major and/or minor external funding awards (major awards are at least $5,000); submission of a major and/or minor external funding proposal (effort for unfunded submissions is recognized, but cannot be used as a substitute or equivalent for funding awards); and internal funding awards.

4. **Reputation within the Discipline:** This domain within research/creative work productivity refers to the scholarly reputation of faculty member generally held by-the members of one's field and, reputation and value of the work to the field. Example Indicators: Scholarly reputation of individual; reputation and value of the work to the field as evidenced by invited papers, invited presentations, editorials, keynotes, editorships, invited peer-reviews, invited visiting appointments, citations, etc.

5. **Other scholarly indicators:** This domain refers to scholarship that may not be traditionally evaluated and includes scholarly or creative work that an individual candidate engages in outside of the university. This type of scholarship does not substitute for peer-reviewed publications. Example Indicators: Non-peer reviewed professional papers; non-peer reviewed professional presentations, consultancies, or institutional outreach.

B. **Research/Creative Productivity Standards for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF)**
HMSLS faculty have provided the information below as *minimum requirements*. We intend this information to guide TTF faculty as they aspire to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires a record of effective teaching, a line of scholarly research/creative productivity, and effective service contributions within and external to BGSU. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost's office.

Research Productivity: Making contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important both in their own right and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional work is vital to the evaluation of faculty members who are undergoing review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank. The School of HMSLS place emphasis on peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional work when reviewing research productivity. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, evaluation of the quality of scholarship shall be performed by the voting faculty in the School of HMSLS who are above the rank of the candidate. Also, external reviewers will appraise the quality of the candidate's scholarship. External reviews of scholarship for all candidate's seeking tenure and/or promotion are required. The process of selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.

To be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty members must include a research narrative, at least five peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works, as well as five peer-reviewed presentations. For tenure and/or promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d below.

(a) A research narrative (of not more than 5 pages) that articulates at least one line of inquiry that can be supported by additional artifacts as well as an explanation of how those artifacts demonstrate how the faculty member has met the standard for research productivity.

(b) A minimum of five (5) peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works or their equivalent (e.g., indicators e - f) are expected when applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published manuscripts.

(c) A minimum of five (5) peer-reviewed presentations, invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at state, regional, national, or international conferences, seminars, or workshops. The candidate must be the 'presenting author' for at least two (2) of the presentations.

(d) External reviews will follow the process outlined by the Provost's Office.

(e) The publication of books, book chapters, book or book series editor, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications are valued as peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works. Scholarly contributions such as senior editorial roles (editorships) to peer-reviewed journals are also valued (Note: editorial boards do not count as scholarship, but may count as service). Aforementioned publications or editorships may be substituted for up to two (2) of the five peer-reviewed publications of indicators b or c.

(f) Securing extramural funding is encouraged, but not required and is one method for demonstrating scholarship. Major external grant awards (as determined by discipline) typically at or above $5,000 may be substituted for up to two (2) peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works required for tenure (indicator b).

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion in rank for tenured faculty members is based upon performance. Any faculty member may perform satisfactorily at the Associate level without necessarily warranting promotion Full Professor. It also is recognized that a period of time shall elapse after a promotion to Associate, during which time further promotion is not normally to be expected. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost's office.

Research Productivity: Making contributions that establish one's reputation as a productive scholar relative to the knowledge base of a discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important both in

their own right and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship is vital to the evaluation of faculty members who are undergoing review for promotion to Professor and serve as an indicator of sustained scholarly productivity. Candidates will provide evidence that they are experts and leaders in their fields. The School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies faculty place emphasis on peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works when reviewing research productivity. For promotion to Professor, evaluation of the quality of research scholarship shall be done by tenured faculty who are Professor rank, and is further validated by external reviewers at Professor rank.

To be considered for promotion to Professor, faculty members must include a research narrative, at least six peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works after promotion to Associate Professor or not counted previously in a promotion review; at least five peer-reviewed presentations given after promotion to Associate Professor or not counted previously in a promotion review and external reviews. If the period since promotion to Associate Professor exceeds six (6) years, either the most recent six (6) years will be considered in the review or the candidate must document, in the research narrative, administrative responsibilities, or other circumstances that precluded the expected scholarship allotment of effort during the period under review. For promotion to Professor, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d below.

(a) A research narrative (of not more than 5 pages) that articulates at least one line of inquiry that can be supported by additional artifacts as well as an explanation of how those artifacts demonstrate how the faculty member has met the standard for research productivity.

(b) A minimum of six (6) peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works or their equivalent (e.g., indicators e - f) are expected when applying for tenure and promotion to Professor. Candidates must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published manuscripts.

(c) A minimum of five (5) peer-reviewed presentations, invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at state, regional, national, or international conferences, seminars, or workshops. The candidate must be the 'presenting author' for at least three (3) of the presentations.

(d) A minimum of three (3) external reviews of scholarly work that demonstrate a contribution to the field and/or comment on the merit of one's work.

(e) The publication of books, book chapters, book or book series editor, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications are valued as peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works. Scholarly contributions such as senior editorial roles (editorships) to peer-reviewed journals are also valued (Note: editorial boards do not count as scholarship, but may count as service). Aforementioned publications or editorships may be substituted for up to three (3) of the six peer-reviewed publications of indicators b or c.

(f) Securing extramural funding is encouraged, but not required and is one method for demonstrating scholarship. Major external grant awards (as determined by discipline) typically at or above $5,000 may be substituted for up to two (2) peer-reviewed scholarly, creative and/or professional works required for tenure (indicator b).

SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS
All tenure-track faculty (TTF) are responsible for participation in effective academic service activities.

A. Content Documentation – Service Effectiveness Portfolio

Documentation of service effectiveness shall take the form of a service portfolio including a service narrative essay of no more than five pages.

There are five major domains for service effectiveness and are noted below:
1. **Program and School Service**
2. **College and University Service**
3. **Professional Service** - Voluntary activities drawing on professional expertise
4. **Other service contributions** - May have N/A in this category.
5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities** - Responsibilities for which 1 or more credit hours of administrative load are assigned (e.g., program coordinator, field experience coordinator, lab coordinator, accreditation leader)

Examples of support data to be used as performance indicators for service include the following:
1. **Program and School Service:** This domain refers to participation in program and/or School committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams) that support the academic and student affairs of the academic program or School of HMSLS. [Note: it is expected that TTF ensure that all program-level service/committee responsibilities are addressed before participating in School-level service.]
    Performance Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number and time commitment of leadership for committee/council positions; other activities that support academic/student activities of the Program/School.

2. **College and University Service:** This domain refers to participation in College and/or University committees or other activities (e.g. governing bodies, special task forces, review teams) that support the academic and student affairs of BGSU.
    Example Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils; number of and time commitment of leadership committee/council positions.

3. **Professional Service:** This service domain refers to contributions to one's academic profession. [Note: This domain does not include paid consultantships or honoraria.]
    Example Indicators: Number of and time commitment to membership on committees/councils at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment of leadership on committee/council, workshops, conferences at local, regional, national or international levels; number and time commitment to manuscript reviews, or editorial boards.

4. **Other Service Contributions:** This service domain refers to drawing upon one's professional/ academic scholarly expertise for the benefit of the public and community partners through voluntary, unremunerated activities.
    Example Indicators: Community service using professional expertise; applying scholarship/creative works to promote community activities, or community service awards, etc.

5. **Assigned Administrative Service Responsibilities:** This domain refers to any administrative activities provided by members of the Collective Bargaining Unit (e.g., undergraduate and graduate program coordinator, field experience, co-op, or clinical coordinator; lab coordinator)
    Example Indicators: Scope and importance of assignment (e.g., size of program, number of constituents served; documented evidence of service contributions).

B. Service Effectiveness Standards by Rank for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF)

HMSLS faculty have provided the information below as *minimum requirements*. We intend this information to guide TTF faculty as they aspire to tenure and/or promotion. Due to the varying nature and expectations of programs, faculty need to provide other artifacts as appropriate to their individual portfolio and clearly explain the artifacts in their narratives.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Service Effectiveness: High quality service performance is a principle component of a faculty member's record. Service activities must have occurred during the review period (i.e., since hire at BGSU). Service effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d below.

(a) A service narrative, of no more than five (5) pages, that delineates how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of individual artifacts selected.

(b) Participation on an average of at least one (1) Program and/or School level committees (standing, ad-hoc, or sub-committees) per year for the period under review.

(c) Participation on at least two (2) College and/or University-level committees during the period under review.

(d) Service to at least one (1) committee/board (e.g., state, regional, national, and/or international professional levels) or other activity provided to a professional association.

(e) Serving on editorial or review boards or as a manuscript reviewer for scholarly/academic periodicals. Note: Senior editorial roles (editorships) on peer-reviewed journals may count toward scholarship.

(f) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to profession and/or university mission provided to constituents within or outside of the university.

(g) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., CAAHEP, CAATE, etc.) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School and may be used as a substitute for artifact b.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations/societies outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator, lab director, or clinical/field experience coordinator. If a course release is connected to these duties, then the candidate's percentage allocation of effort will be considered in the evaluation. In this case, the candidate will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include support documents consistent with the assignment.

(j) Other evidence of service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Service Effectiveness: Effective service performance is an expectation of a faculty member's record during the review period. Service effectiveness areas are specified below. For promotion to Professor, faculty must include, at a minimum, a-d.

(a) A service narrative, of no more than five (5) pages, that delineates how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, provided service leadership, and includes descriptions of individual artifacts selected.

(b) Participation on an average of at least one (1) Program and/or School level committees (standing, ad-hoc, or sub-committees) per year for the period under review. A leadership role is expected for at least one (1) Program and/or School committee.

(c) Participation on at least three (3) College and/or University-level committees during the period under review.

(d) Participation on at least two (2) committee/board (e.g., state, regional, national, and/or international professional levels) or other activity provided to a professional association.

(e) Serving on editorial or review boards or as a manuscript reviewer for scholarly/academic periodicals. Note: Senior editorial roles (editorships) on peer-reviewed journals may count toward scholarship.

(f) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to profession and/or university mission provided to constituents within or outside of the university.

(g) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., CAAHEP, CAATE, etc.) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School and may be used as a substitute for artifact b.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations/societies outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator, lab director, or clinical/field experience coordinator. If a course release is connected to these duties, then the candidate's percentage allocation of effort will be considered in the evaluation. In this case, the candidate will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include support documents consistent with the assignment.

(j) Other evidence of service as appropriate and explained in the service narrative.

V. School of HMSLS Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Materials

A. PRC Review and voting processes for tenure and promotion (T&P)
   1) Candidates will submit their portfolios consistent with established HMSLS and University formats and deadlines.
B. Credential Submission and Review Process;
   1) The School Personnel Committee will review each candidate's credentials. The credentials should include:
      a) A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae in the required University format,
      b) The evaluative memoranda from each level of review from each year of the review period as appropriate,
      c) A summary of the faculty member's workload assignment for each semester during the review period,
      d) Appropriate portfolio(s) representing the faculty member's workload assignment (i.e., teaching effectiveness, professional development/research/creative productivity, and/or service effectiveness),
      e) Summary of student evaluations of instruction (SEI) for each course by semester,
      f) External letters of review when required.

Approved by the School of Human Movement, Sport and Leisure Studies

School Director _____ Date _12.20.17_

Reviewed by the Dean _____ Date _12/20/17_

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

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost _____ Date _12/21/17_

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