Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: **Department of Management** (Approved April 25, 2018)

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

Annual performance will be assessed by the Chair, who will consider the quality of instruction delivered by NTTF, the NTTF's participation in service activities, and the NTTF's professional development activities. Student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for the evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Performance is deemed satisfactory in the event that NTTF receive a positive peer evaluation and earn quantitative evaluation scores that are comparable to or exceed the department standards. Peer evaluations that indicate the NTTF is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. For instructors whose quantitative evaluations are substantially below (i.e. 2.6 points or more on the 4-point scale) the department standard, the Chair may turn to additional evidence such as course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, and so forth) and peer evaluations of teaching to determine whether the instructor is performing adequately. In the event the instructor is deemed to not be performing adequately in his/her position, the Chair may provide guidance on how the NTTF can improve his/her performance or recommend to the Dean that the NTTF not be renewed.

Enhanced Performance Review criteria largely parallel those guiding APRs, but span the past three years of performance and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. NTTF will not only be evaluated on their student evaluations and peer classroom evaluations but also on the quality of their teaching, service, and professional development activities, supporting documents, and course materials.

B.1.1. Performance Standards in Teaching

Exceeds Expectations in Teaching

Highly effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation:

- Demonstrates continuous improvement and/or innovation in classroom delivery;
- Demonstrates professional development through continued education, certification, consulting, instructional publications and/or presentations related to the NTTF's field and teaching area to meet the minimum College of Business requirements for AACSB qualification;
- Student evaluations of teaching typically average 3.0 or higher on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size,

SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- Responds to recommendations raised by peers and students; and
- Demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.

On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. On-going significant contributions considering quality and depth or breadth in non-classroom instruction, or professional development and teaching support. Contributions in at least two areas is required. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
- Guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
- Teaching independent studies;
- Advising of a student professional organization;
- Oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
- Professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
- Developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
- Participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities;
- Developing textbooks/instructional materials;
- Developing new teaching methods; or
- Designing applied learning activities such as field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

Meets Expectations in Teaching

Effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:
- Peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- Student evaluations of teaching typically average in the range of 2.6 to 2.99 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- Responds to recommendations raised by peers and students;
- Demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- Demonstrates professional development through annual continued education, certification, consulting, instructional publications and/or presentations related to the NTTF's field and teaching area to meet the minimum College of Business requirements for AACSB qualifications.

On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected.

At least one additional contribution per year in non-classroom instruction, professional development, or teaching support is expected. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:

- Guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
- Teaching independent studies;
- Advising of a student professional organization;
- Oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
- Professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
- Developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
- Participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities;
- Developing textbooks/instructional materials;
- Developing new teaching methods; or
- Designing applied learning activities such as field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

Does Not Meet Expectations

Ineffective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- The majority of peer evaluations reflect ineffective teaching;
- Student teaching evaluations average less than 2.6 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered; and
- Non-responsive to recommendations raised by peers and students; and, there are concerns with other aspects such as course content, design and pedagogy, assessment, and course management systems use; student feedback, and responsiveness for student consultation.
- Does not demonstrate professional development through continued education, certification, consulting, instructional publications and/or presentations related to the NTTF's field and teaching area to meet the minimum College of Business requirements for AACSB requirements.

Lack of On-going Contributions. Does not fulfill student advising responsibilities as assigned; and, there is little or no evidence of on-going contributions in non-classroom instruction, professional development, and teaching support.

B.1.2. Performance Standards in Service

Exceeds Expectations in Service

- Fully participates in Department level service requirements;

- Contributes to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities;
- Demonstrates leadership or a significant level of involvement in Department, College, University, or Professional service.

Meets Expectations in Service

- Fully participates in Department-level service requirements;
- May contribute to at least one College, University, or Professional service by serving on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities (for EPR).

Does Not Meet Expectations in Service

- Does not fully participate in Department level service; or,
- Does not contribute to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or doing program planning or other activities.

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

Annual Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member submit their Faculty Service Document with any supporting materials to the Chair.

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

- Teaching philosophy narrative that describes the candidate's approach to teaching.
- Quantitative course evaluations, where applicable, for courses taught in the past three years.
- Peer teaching evaluations from all of the faculty members who conducted an evaluation of their teaching during the past three years.
- Representative course syllabi for courses taught during the past three years. Other materials that demonstrate effectiveness of teaching should be included as well. Items that indicate teaching innovation may be included but not required.
- Service philosophy narrative summarizing the candidate's service activities during the probationary period, and goals for the future, and documentation of service activities.
- Professional development narrative that describes the candidate's approach to professional development and evidence of professional development activities.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

NTTF are expected to make contributions in teaching and service and meet minimum the College's requirements for AACSB qualification. The specific contributions are outlined in the Reappointment section of this document sections B.1.1 through B.1.2. AACSB qualifications are outlined in the policy guidelines set by the College of Business.

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

   At minimum the candidate:
   - Meets Expectations in Teaching (see Part II, section B.1.1. pages 2-3)
   - Meets Expectation in Service (see Part II, section B.1.2. pages 3-4)

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

   At minimum the candidate:
   - Exceeds Expectations in Teaching (see Part II, section B.1.1. pages 1-2)
   - Meets Expectation in Service (see Part II, section B.1.2. pages 3-4)

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

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

1. Teaching philosophy narrative that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
2. Quantitative course evaluations, if applicable, for courses taught since at BGSU
3. At least one peer teaching evaluation since last promotion

Internal procedures for creation and submission of APR and EPR material must be consistent with the process outlined in the CBA and must comply with the timeliness required by the Office of the Provost.

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the College's cumulative review form covering the faculty member's entire term of service at BGSU with emphasis on accomplishments during the review period.

The candidate submits a portfolio of representative samples that document contributions in teaching and service. The portfolios must include a summary of student evaluations, peer

evaluations, syllabi, a teaching and service philosophy statements. Other supporting materials demonstrating performance such as teaching materials, reports, presentations, articles and other materials deemed relevant by the candidate may be included.

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.

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

Successful candidates will demonstrate effective teaching; research activity that culminates in peer-reviewed publications; and service at the department, college, or university level. As they progress on the tenure track, successful candidates will demonstrate an accumulation of teaching, research, and service activities that reflect a growth in productivity (both quality and quantity) over the six year period. Candidates are expected to achieve on average one peer reviewed journal publication per year that is on the approved list recognized by the Department of Management or College of Business. Also, evidence of manuscripts under review or revision at journals on the approved lists, and presentations of research at academic conferences are demonstrative of research activity which signals likely research productivity during the first and second year. Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review during the third year, successful candidates for the fourth and fifth year annual reviews will show sustained (or increased) research activity as well as research productivity. The candidate will show evidence of progress towards one top tier journal publication among the average of five peer-reviewed journal publication or equivalent on the approved list during the probationary period. Similarly, successful candidates will show evidence of strong teaching effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, ultimately comparable with or exceeding departmental standards in their teaching evaluations, receiving positive peer evaluations, preparing and implementing active learning course materials that engage students in the learning process and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also show evidence of successful teaching at the graduate level. Finally, the scope and level of service engaged in by successful candidates will typically reflect an increase over the six year period. By the end of the probationary period, successful candidates will have service contributions at the college or university and to their profession at the regional, national or international levels as well as their annual department level service.

The Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) typically occurs during the fall semester of the candidate's third year on the tenure track. At this point, the candidate must demonstrate success in teaching, research, and service. Specifically, to demonstrate success in teaching, criteria include quantitative teaching evaluations that are consistently comparable with or exceed the department standard and primarily positive peer evaluations. Research success shall be indicated by research *productivity*, namely peer reviewed journal articles published or in press since the initial hire on the approved Department of Management or College list. Other indicators of research activity of relevance include peer review journal articles under review or revision, refereed book chapters, non-refereed book chapters, refereed presentations and non-refereed

presentations at regional, national or international academic conferences. Service success shall be indicated by service contribution on recognized Department, College and/or University level committees. Other indicators of service activity include participation in Department, College and/ or activities such as preview days, graduation, task forces, sub-committees, etc.

a. Expectations for Teaching

i. Exceeds Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching exceeds expectations when they exhibit highly effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation:

- peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- demonstrates continuous improvement and/or innovation in classroom delivery;
- student evaluations of teaching average 3.0 or higher on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students; and
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. On-going significant contributions considering quality and depth or breadth in non-classroom instruction, or professional development and teaching support. Contributions in two or more areas is required each year. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities; developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

ii. Meets Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching meet expectations when they exhibit effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- student evaluations of teaching average in the range of 2.6 to 2.99 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students;
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. At least one additional contribution in non-classroom instruction, professional development, or teaching support is expected. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities;
  - ⇒ developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations. The faculty member's contributions in teaching do not meet expectations when they exhibit ineffective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- the majority of peer evaluations reflect ineffective teaching;

- student teaching evaluations average less than 2.6 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- non-responsive to recommendations raised by peers and students; and, there are concerns with other aspects such as course content, design and pedagogy, assessment, and course management systems use; student feedback, and responsiveness for student consultation; and
- demonstrates a lack of on-going contributions. Does not fulfill student advising responsibilities as assigned; and, there is little or no evidence of on-going contributions in non-classroom instruction, professional development, and teaching support.

b. Expectations for Research

i. Exceeds Expectations for Research. For the APR in year one, the probationary faculty member exceeds the expectations for research by completing at least one peer-reviewed publication (or its equivalent) as recognized by the department during the evaluation period with evidence of ongoing research. For the APR in year two, the probationary faculty member exceeds expectations by completing an average of more than one peer-reviewed publication (or its equivalent) as recognized by the department during the evaluation period with evidence of ongoing research. For the APR in years four and five and the EPR in years 3, the probationary faculty member exceeds expectations by completing an average of more than one peer-reviewed publication (or its equivalent) as recognized by the department per year during the evaluation period with evidence of ongoing research, and at least one of the publications in a top tier journal as recognized by the department.

ii. Meets Expectations for Research. For the EPR, the probationary faculty member should have two peer-reviewed publications (or its equivalent) as recognized by the department during the previous three years with evidence of ongoing research activity. However, the faculty member may meet expectations by completing one peer-reviewed publication as recognized by the department during the previous three years with significant evidence of work in progress as demonstrated manuscripts with revise and resubmits, along with other manuscripts under review, research actively in progress, and papers delivered at professional conferences.

Successful candidates being evaluated for research must demonstrate research activity that culminates in research productivity of five peer reviewed publications with one of them being a top tier publication as recognized by the department prior to the beginning of the sixth year (or at the time of review for promotion and tenure, whichever comes first). In

addition, the candidate will have demonstrated evidence of ongoing research activity.

For the APR in year one, the probationary faculty member should have evidence of ongoing research such as multiple manuscripts under review or at least one manuscript being revised for resubmission. For the APR in year two, the probationary faculty member should have at least one peer reviewed publication (or its equivalent) as recognized by the department with evidence of ongoing research activity. For the APR in years four and five, the probationary faculty member must be making significant progress towards the five peer reviewed publications (or its equivalent) with one of them in a top tier journal as recognized by the department with evidence of ongoing research activity.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations in Research. The faculty member does not meet the expectations for research by not completing one peer-reviewed publication as recognized by the department during the previous three years.

c. Expectations for Service

i. Exceeds Expectations in Service during the previous year(s) by:
- Fully participates in Department level service requirements;
- contributes to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities;
- demonstrates leadership or a significant level of involvement in Department, College, University, or Professional service.

ii. Meets Expectations in Service during the previous year(s) by:
- Fully participates in Department-level service requirements;
- contributes to at least one College, University, or Professional service by serving on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities. While it is generally expected that more junior faculty will have less service activity than more senior faculty members, evidence of interest and contributions in this area must be provided.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations in Service during the previous year(s) by:
- Does not fully participate in Department level service; or,
- does not contribute to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or doing program planning or other activities.

Internal procedures for creation and submission of APR and EPR materials must be consistent with the process outlined in the CBA and must comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

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

Annual Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member submit their Faculty Service document along with additional materials, such as copies of publications, peer evaluation of teaching, and other supporting documents of research, teaching, and service activities to the Chair.

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her CV and cumulative Faculty Service document with emphasis on activity during the review period and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching Philosophy narrative that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
- Quantitative course evaluations for courses taught at BGSU, if applicable, during the review period
- Annual peer evaluations of teaching for probationary faculty
- Course materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness
- Service philosophy narrative summarizing the candidate's service activities over the review period and goals for the future
- Research narrative that describes the candidate's research contributions
- Copies of published scholarly work

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

APR Procedure (Article 14, 6.2.3)

The Department Chair shall perform a review to evaluate the probationary TTF member's progress in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the performance review policy. All voting eligible Bargaining Unit Faculty Members may provide input to the Department Chair that may be integrated into the Chair's letter.

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

Criteria and Standards for Tenure

At a minimum, the candidate will meet expectations in Research, Teaching and Service.

a. Expectations for Teaching

i. Exceeds Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching exceeds expectations when they exhibit highly effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation:

- peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- demonstrates continuous improvement and/or innovation in classroom delivery;
- student evaluations of teaching average 3.0 or higher on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students; and
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. On-going significant contributions considering quality and depth or breadth in non-classroom instruction, or professional development and teaching support. Contributions in two or more areas per year is required. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities; developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

ii. Meets Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching meets expectations when they exhibit effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class

size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- student evaluations of teaching average in the range of 2.6 to 2.99 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students;
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. At least one additional contribution per year in non-classroom instruction, professional development, or teaching support is expected. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities;
  - ⇒ developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching does not meet expectations when they exhibit ineffective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- the majority of peer evaluations reflect ineffective teaching;
- student teaching evaluations average less than 2.6 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered; and

- non-responsive to recommendations raised by peers and students; and, there are concerns with other aspects such as course content, design and pedagogy, assessment, and course management systems use; student feedback, and responsiveness for student consultation.
- Lack of On-going Contributions. Does not fulfill student advising responsibilities as assigned; and, there is little or no evidence of on-going contributions in non-classroom instruction, professional development, and teaching support.

b. Expectations for Research

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure is based on evidence that the candidate has developed a stream of research in his/her field and is published in recognized academic journals in addition to the expectations below:

i. Exceeds Expectations for Research. The faculty member exceeds the expectations for research by:
   - averaging more than one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the five years immediately preceding the review for tenure with one or more of those publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department; or,
   - the faculty member averages one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the five years immediately preceding the review for tenure with more than one of the publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department,
   - showing ongoing research activities as described in this document in section 2 of Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials.

ii. Meets Expectations for Research. The faculty member meets the expectations for research by averaging at least one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the five years immediately preceding the review for tenure with at least one of those publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department. In addition, the assessment considers ongoing research activities as described in this document in section 2 of Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Research. The faculty member does not meet the expectations for research by averaging at less than one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the five years immediately preceding the review for tenure with no publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department.

c. Expectations for Service

i. Exceeds Expectations for Service

- Fully participates in Department level service requirements annually during the review period;
- contributes to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities annually during the review period;
- demonstrates leadership or a significant level of involvement in Department, College, University, or Professional service for one academic year during the review period.

ii. Meets Expectations for Service

- Fully participates in Department-level service requirements annually during the review period;
- contributes to at least one College, University, or Professional service by serving on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities annually during the review period. While it is generally expected that more junior faculty will have less service activity than more senior faculty members, evidence of interest and contributions in this area must be provided.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Service

- Does not fully participate in Department level service; or,
- does not contribute to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or doing program planning or other activities.

1. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The criteria and standards for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is the same as the criteria for tenure. At a minimum, the candidate will meet expectations in Research, Teaching and Service. .

2. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A recommendation for promotion to the rank of (full) professor is based upon a holistic assessment of a candidate's contributions to teaching, research and service throughout the candidate's entire academic career. The recommendation is based on the premise that a successful candidate has continued to demonstrate quality contributions in teaching, research and service since promotion to associate professor. At a minimum, the candidate will exceed expectations in either Research or Teaching and meet expectations in the other two areas of teaching, research, and service.

a. Expectations for Teaching

i. Exceeds Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching exceeds expectations when they exhibit leadership in the effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Successful candidates are expected to demonstrate initiative and leadership by actively assuming responsibilities relating to the Department, College, University, profession, or external community. Factors such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation:

- extensive variety of undergraduate and/ or graduate courses taught to contribute to the mission of the department;
- extensive involvement in curriculum development, new course development and/ or delivery methods to contribute to the mission of the department demonstrates continuous improvement and/or innovation in classroom delivery;
- student evaluations of teaching average 3.0 or higher on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students; and
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. On-going significant contributions considering quality and depth or breadth in non-classroom instruction, or professional development and teaching support. Contributions in two or more areas per year are required. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities; developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

ii. Meets Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching meet expectations when they exhibit effective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- some variety of undergraduate or graduate courses taught to meet the mission of the department;
- some involvement in curriculum development or new course development and delivery to meet the mission of the department
- peer evaluations reflect effective teaching;
- student evaluations of teaching average in the range of 2.6 to 2.99 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered;
- responds to recommendations raised by peers and students;
- demonstrates appropriate and relevant course content, design and pedagogy, assessment and feedback, and use of the University's learning management system.
- On-going Contributions. Fulfillment of assigned advising responsibilities is expected. At least one additional contribution in non-classroom instruction, professional development, or teaching support is expected. Ways to contribute may include, but are not limited to:
  - ⇒ guiding undergraduate or graduate research, honors projects and thesis research;
  - ⇒ teaching independent studies;
  - ⇒ advising of a student professional organization;
  - ⇒ oversight of student-related activities not directly related to a course (such as competitions, directed readings, non-course field trips, student success activities, and special studies)
  - ⇒ professional development related to pedagogy or teaching;
  - ⇒ developing new courses or significant modification of an existing course;
  - ⇒ participating in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities;
  - ⇒ developing textbooks/instructional materials;
  - ⇒ developing new teaching methods; or
  - ⇒ designing applied learning activities such as field trips, field projects, creative contributions, and service learning.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Teaching. The faculty member's contributions in teaching do not meet expectations when they exhibit ineffective delivery of classroom and/or online instruction. Factors such as such as type of courses taught, class size, variety of preparations and delivery

mode are to be considered. Specifically, the following will be used in the evaluation of instruction:

- no variety in undergraduate and/ or graduate courses taught
- no involvement in curriculum develop or new course development or delivery to meet the mission of the department
- the majority of peer evaluations reflect ineffective teaching;
- student teaching evaluations average less than 2.6 on the Department's 0-4 point scale; however, factors such as the variety of courses taught, class size, SET response rate, course delivery method, new prep, new or redesigned course, or innovation will be considered; and
- non-responsive to recommendations raised by peers and students; and, there are concerns with other aspects such as course content, design and pedagogy, assessment, and course management systems use; student feedback, and responsiveness for student consultation.
- Lack of On-going Contributions. Does not fulfill student advising responsibilities as assigned; and, there is little or no evidence of on-going contributions in non-classroom instruction, professional development, and teaching support.

b. Expectations for Research

Faculty publications appearing in journals that are listed on the approved department and college journal list will be given full consideration. Other journal publications may be considered by the review committee based on the publication's impact (e.g., recognition through awards, citations, contribution to the field, etc.). External letters of evaluation will also be used to judge scholarly reputation.

i. Exceeds Expectations for Research. The faculty member exceeds the expectations for research by exhibiting leadership toward the advancement of research and averaging more than one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the previous five years. This includes having two or more publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department with one or more occurring since achieving tenure at BGSU. Successful candidates are expected to demonstrate initiative and leadership by actively assuming research responsibilities relating to the Department, College, University, profession, or external community (e.g., research workshop coordinator, research taskforce leadership, research conference leadership, editorial leadership, academic conference leadership, research grant leadership, etc.).

ii. Meets Expectations for Research. The faculty member meets the expectations for research by averaging at least one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the previous five years and having at least two publications in a top-tier

journal as recognized by the department with at least one occurring since achieving tenure at BGSU.

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Research. The faculty member does not meet the expectations for research by averaging less than one refereed publication as recognized by the department or its equivalent per year during the previous five years and having less than two publications in a top-tier journal as recognized by the department with one not occurring since achieving tenure at BGSU.

c. Expectations for Service

i. Exceeds Expectations for Service
- Fully participates in Department level service requirements;
- contributes to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities;
- demonstrates leadership or a significant level of involvement in Department, College, University, or Professional service. Successful candidates are expected to demonstrate initiative and leadership by actively assuming responsibilities relating to the Department, College, University, profession, or external community.

ii. Meets Expectations for Service
- Fully participates in Department-level service requirements;
- contributes to at least one College, University, or Professional service by serving on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or contributing to program planning or other activities per year, on average

iii. Does Not Meet Expectations for Service
- Does not fully participate in Department level service; or,
- does not contribute to College, University, or Professional service by being on committees, ad hoc task forces, boards, or doing program planning or other activities.

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

Each faculty member submits the following materials for evaluation:
- The College's cumulative review form covering the faculty member's term of service at BGSU;

- A portfolio of representative samples that support the materials highlighted in the cumulative review form. Candidates should include materials that document their contributions in teaching and service and their ongoing professional development;
- Other materials deemed relevant by the candidate may be submitted to the committee for their consideration.

In addition, the following materials will be also evaluated:

- Previous annual/enhanced performance reviews (for the faculty member seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor);
- For probationary faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, annual peer evaluations of teaching will be included. For TTF seeking promotion from associate to full professor, at least one peer evaluation of teaching review since last promotion will be included;
- Other materials relevant to the candidate's performance.

The tenure and promotion materials are required in three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. Within each area, a common set of contributions applies to all evaluations. The specific standards are based on these contributions and vary by type of evaluation.

1. Teaching

Candidates must show evidence of teaching activities both inside and outside of the classroom. The faculty member's teaching portfolios should include student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, a teaching philosophy statement, and other relevant items. Evidence of contributions may include, but is not limited to the following:

a. Delivery of instruction
   - Student evaluations of teaching are required
   - Peer evaluations are required
   - Documented outcome assessment results
   - Courses taught, number, class size, and variety of preparation
   - Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

b. Delivery in other instructional settings; e.g.
   - Guiding undergraduate research, thesis research, and doctoral dissertations
   - Teaching independent studies
   - Advising special projects
   - Teaching awards
   - Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity

c. Professional development and Teaching support activity; e.g.
   - Syllabi for course taught
   - Teaching philosophy statement

- Course development
- Curriculum/program development
- Participation in undergraduate and/or graduate curricular activities
- Teaching methods development
- Professional development related to teaching
- Textbooks/instructional materials development
- Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities

d. Provide support to external communities for the teaching of Management or in an interdisciplinary course

2. Research

Candidates must show evidence of an ongoing research program resulting in scholarly publications and presentations at scholarly meetings. The faculty member's evidence of research productivity may include, but is not limited to the following:

a. Refereed Publications
   - Journal articles
   - Other Refereed Publications
     - Monographs
     - Book Chapters

b. Refereed Presentations
   - Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
   - Proceeding publications

c. Other Contributions
   - Published book reviews
   - Published cases
   - Non-refereed articles, presentations, and book chapters
   - Books (non-textbooks)

d. Research Recognition
   - Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
   - Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
   - Attainment of research grants
   - Receipt of research honors and awards

e. Research Support Activities
   - Miscellaneous research support activities
   - Reviewing for journals/conferences

f. Professional Development Activities Related to Research (Institutional Outreach)

3. Service

Candidates must show evidence of participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, programs, and the mission of the Department, College and University, as well as service

to the faculty member's profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component may include, but are not limited to the following:

a. University Governance
   - Leadership positions
   - Membership on College committees
   - Membership on Department committees
   - Membership on University committees
   - Other University governance activities

b. Professional Activities
   - Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   - Leadership positions in professional organizations
   - Membership in professional organizations

c. Service Recognition Awards

d. Other Service Activities
   - Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
   - Support department programs that provide services to students
   - Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
   - Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students
   - Administrative assignments
   - Advising student clubs
   - Oversee preparation for student competitions
   - Editorial boards

e. Professional consulting to other organizations

f. Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.

g. Working with Centers and Institutes

The Department of Management faculty voted via email on April 25, 2018. This document was voted on and approved by the majority of the Department of Management faculty members. The vote was 12 faculty members in favor and 2 faculty members did not vote.

Chair Amelia A. Carr Date 4/30/18

Reviewed by the Dean _____ Date 4/30/18

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

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost _____ Date 5/1/18

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