

## Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Physics and Astronomy

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

##### 1. Criteria for Annual Performance Reviews

For a typical NTTF, teaching is the primary aspect of the workload, with a small portion of time devoted to service in some form. An 80/20 (teaching/service) split is the usual standard unless assigned otherwise. The following describes the APR criteria to be used in the typical case, however in all cases assigned deviations from the typical workload are to be taken into account when evaluating a specific faculty member.

**Teaching:** It is expected that each faculty member will contribute to the teaching mission of the Department. As minimum norms a faculty member is expected to carry out assigned teaching responsibilities according to appropriate professional norms. Such norms include (but are not limited to): setting appropriate academic standards for classes, meeting all assigned classes (outside of illness or emergency), being prepared to conduct classes, being available to students outside of class, and responding appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints. Besides failing to meet such norms, indicators of unsatisfactory teaching would include (but are not limited to): persistent legitimate student complaints, substantially negative student evaluations, and substantially negative peer evaluations. Indicators of effective teaching include (but are not limited to): substantially positive student evaluations, substantially positive peer evaluations, development/use of innovative pedagogy, course/laboratory/curriculum development, conducting independent study courses, supervising undergraduate and graduate student research (especially when the research leads to publication or professional presentation), teaching awards, and participation in teaching conferences. For student evaluations, less emphasis is placed on quantitative scores although they are benchmarked to Department course averages for comparable courses (e.g. level and delivery type). Greater emphasis is placed on the qualitative student evaluations, which should be substantially free of red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom.

In sum, an Instructor would be considered to meet expectations by meeting the minimum norms described above and lacking any of the unsatisfactory indicators, together with overall consistently positive student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and teaching the appropriate curriculum, and quantitative evaluations that typically hover around the Department benchmark for comparable courses. Other indicators of effective teaching described above also may be considered.

**Service:** The candidate is expected to compile a record of regularly and effectively serving the needs of the Department, College, and/or University through participation in recruiting and retaining students, and through participation in Department, College, and University committees as assigned or as opportunities arise. In addition to committee work, evidence of service includes the delivery of public science presentations and management, development, and maintenance of facilities used for outreach or other activities of the Department. The candidate may also perform service to the professional community at the local, state, national, or international levels is also, for instance by professional refereeing, society offices held, journal editorships, committee service, and hosting conferences and meetings. The candidate is expected to perform service in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload, typically one significant committee (or equivalent) plus one other significant service activity per year.

**Research:** NTTFs are typically not expected to conduct research; however, they are expected to remain informed in their discipline in order to be effective in their teaching. If research activity is present this may be taken into consideration in a positive sense if it enhances teaching and/or service. However, in no case shall lack of research activity be considered as a negative in the review.

## 2. Criteria for Enhanced Performance Reviews

The criteria for successful completion of the EPR for NTTF shall be substantially similar to that of the APR, with the distinction that the EPR covers a three-year period and thus can consider improvement in areas of weakness and continued efforts to maintain areas of strength over time.

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

#### 1. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of NTTF in Years One through Six

The NTTF member shall provide to the Chair his/her current curriculum vitae (CV) in standard University format no later than four weeks prior to the deadline for submission of the Chair's recommendation to the Dean.

The Chair may also use student evaluation materials from the preceding year, the most recent peer evaluation, and the most recent annual faculty record update and summary of activity. The written recommendation shall include a list of resources consulted.

#### 2. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of NTTF in Years One through Six

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a portfolio consisting of his/her current CV and the following additional supporting materials: peer teaching reviews, student evaluations, any relevant workload agreements, indicators of effective teaching, and a faculty statement. Peer reviews shall be conducted yearly by tenured faculty or NTTF of higher rank. Student evaluations shall include numerical

summaries and complete written comments from all courses taught at BGSU in the preceding three years. The faculty statement shall be a 1-3 page reflective statement by the faculty member summarizing his/her work (teaching, research, and service as appropriate) during the preceding three years. The portfolio shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

To facilitate the preparation of the portfolio, the Chair shall make available to the faculty member peer reviews and student evaluation data (summaries and comments) no later than two weeks prior to the candidate's submission deadline for the portfolio.

The EPR committee of the Department, consisting of three elected faculty eligible to contribute to the EPR recommendation, shall ensure that all eligible faculty are given access to the candidate's portfolio and shall call a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the review. The EPR committee shall then write a report reflecting the discussion and general consensus of the eligible faculty, including an explanation of any differences of opinion, and shall circulate the report to the eligible faculty for review a minimum of two days prior to submitting it.

#### **Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process**

The Chair shall solicit written comments from faculty eligible to serve on the Department EPR committee.

#### **Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review**

1. The criteria for promotion from Instructor to Lecturer shall be that the candidate holds a Ph.D. and meets the specific performance criteria below.

**Teaching:** The faculty member will have established a sustained record of effective teaching, exhibiting a diverse range of indicators including overall consistently positive student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and teaching the appropriate curriculum, quantitative evaluations that typically hover around the Department benchmark for comparable courses, instructional innovation, course/laboratory/curriculum development and supervising students in independent study or research. The faculty member is expected to achieve strong performance in multiple of these teaching indicators. The faculty member is expected to demonstrate clear efforts to improve in teaching, for instance through participation in teaching-related learning communities, workshops, or conferences.

**Service:** The faculty member will have established a sustained record of substantial service to the Department and also to the College, the University, the community and/or the profession. The faculty member is expected to achieve strong performance in one or a combination of service roles or to demonstrate substantial service leadership, for instance through mentoring other faculty or initiating important service activities. Service to the profession is not

expected, but will also count as part of the service contribution. The cumulative service record should typically amount to at least one significant committee (or equivalent) plus one other significant service activity per year.

2. The criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer shall be that the candidate holds a Ph.D. and meets the specific performance criteria below.

**Teaching:** The faculty member will have established a sustained record of effective teaching, exhibiting a diverse range of indicators (described above) since promotion to Lecturer including overall consistently positive student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and teaching the appropriate curriculum, and quantitative evaluations that typically hover around the Department benchmark for comparable courses, instructional innovation, course/laboratory/curriculum development and supervising students. The faculty member is expected to achieve excellent performance in multiple of these teaching indicators. The faculty member is expected to demonstrate clear efforts while a Lecturer to improve in teaching, for instance through participation in teaching-related learning communities, workshops, or conferences. The faculty member is expected to demonstrate teaching leadership beyond their own classes, for instance through mentoring other faculty in teaching, leading teaching workshops, presentations at regional or national teaching conferences, textbook authoring, or significant contributions to pedagogy in the field.

**Service:** The faculty member will have established a sustained record of substantial service to the Department and also to the College, the University, the community and/or the profession. The faculty member is expected to achieve excellent performance in multiple service roles (e.g. committees at different levels, recruiting, public outreach) and to demonstrate substantial service leadership, for instance through mentoring other faculty or initiating important service activities. Service to the profession is not expected, but will also count as part of the service contribution. The cumulative service record over the six most recent years should typically amount to at least one significant committee (or equivalent) plus two other significant service activities per year.

### **Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials**

The candidate for promotion shall submit a portfolio including a complete, current CV in standard University format, plus the following materials covering the most recent years of service since starting at BGSU or since the candidate's last promotion, not to exceed six years:

- all available student evaluations, including numerical summaries and complete written comments, from courses taught at BGSU
- all available (minimum of three) peer teaching evaluations
- a 1-3 page teaching statement
- 3-5 teaching artifacts as identified in the College guidelines
- a 1-3 page service statement
- up to 5 service artifacts as identified in the College guidelines (optional).

The portfolio shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost. To facilitate portfolio preparation, the Chair shall make available all peer review and student evaluation data (summaries and comments) no later than two weeks prior to the submission deadline for the portfolio.

The TAPS-B committee of the Department, consisting of three elected faculty eligible to vote (including at least one NTTF member if possible), shall ensure that all eligible faculty are given access to the candidate's portfolio and shall call a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss and vote on the promotion. In the interests of transparency and proper opportunity for rebuttal, the vote shall be an open vote. TAPS-B shall write a report summarizing the discussion and the vote, including an explanation of any votes of dissent. Any vote of dissent without a stated reason explicitly addressing the applicable criteria for promotion found in this document shall be noted as such in the report. TAPS-B shall circulate the report to the eligible faculty for review a minimum of two days prior to submitting it to the Chair. Eligible voting faculty may submit signed written statements as well as suggested changes to the committee report to the committee chair. The final report, including any submitted statements, shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

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

The criteria for successful APRs and EPR for TTF shall be adequate cumulative progress toward the requirements for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor as described later in this document, acknowledging that progress may be slower than average during the first couple years. Adequate progress in teaching over the period of review is equivalent to the standard for tenure, namely meeting minimum norms, lacking any of the unsatisfactory indicators, and having a consistent record of effective teaching. During the first couple years, extra weight will be given to demonstrated efforts to correct any areas of weak performance. Progress in research will be evaluated in light of extra effort or delays beyond the candidate's control involved in establishing a laboratory or other research facilities. For the EPR, typically, at least one refereed paper published or in press since the initial hire as well as clear efforts to obtain external funding are expected. Adequate progress in service over the period of review is equivalent to the standard for tenure, to perform service in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload, typically one committee or equivalent per year.

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

1. For an APR, the TTF member shall provide to the Chair a current CV in standard University format no later than four weeks prior to the deadline for submission of the Chair's recommendation to the Dean. The APR will also be based on all of the faculty member's available student evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, annual faculty record updates and summaries of activity, and other pertinent material the Chair may request.
2. For an EPR, the TTF member shall submit a portfolio consisting of:

- a complete, current CV in standard University format
- all available student evaluations, including numerical summaries and complete written comments, from courses taught at BGSU
- all available (minimum of three) peer teaching evaluations by faculty of higher rank
- a 1-3 page teaching statement
- 3-5 teaching artifacts as identified in the College guidelines
- a 1-3 page research/creative work statement
- 3-5 research/creative work artifacts as identified in the College guidelines
- a 1-3 page service statement
- up to 5 service artifacts as identified in the College guidelines (optional).

The portfolio shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

To facilitate the preparation of the portfolio, the Chair shall make available to the faculty member peer reviews and student evaluation data (summaries and comments) no later than two weeks prior to the submission deadline for the portfolio.

The TAPS-A committee of the Department, consisting of three elected faculty eligible to vote, shall ensure that all eligible faculty are given access to the candidate's portfolio and shall call a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the review and to vote by secret ballot. TAPS-A shall then write a report summarizing the discussion and the vote, and shall circulate the report to the eligible faculty for review a minimum of two days prior to submitting it to the Chair. Eligible voting faculty may submit signed written statements as well as suggested changes to the committee report to the committee chair. The final report, including any submitted statements, shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

### **Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process**

The Chair shall solicit written comments from faculty eligible to serve on the Department TAPS-A committee.

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

#### **A. Standards for Tenure**

The promotion decision is based on performance indicators in three major categories: teaching, research, and service.

**Teaching:** It is expected that each faculty member will contribute to the teaching mission of the Department. As a minimum standard a faculty member is expected to carry out assigned teaching responsibilities according to appropriate professional norms. Such norms include (but are not limited to): setting appropriate academic standards for classes, meeting all

assigned classes (outside of illness or emergency), being prepared to conduct classes, being available to students outside of class, and responding appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints. Besides failing to meet such norms, indicators of unsatisfactory teaching would include (but are not limited to): persistent legitimate student complaints, substantially negative student evaluations, and substantially negative peer evaluations. Indicators of effective teaching include (but are not limited to): overall consistently positive student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and teaching the appropriate curriculum, and quantitative evaluations that typically hover around the Department benchmark for comparable courses, development/use of innovative pedagogy, course/laboratory/curriculum development, conducting independent study courses, supervising undergraduate and graduate student research (especially when the research leads to publication or professional presentation), advising theses/dissertations, serving on thesis/dissertation committees, teaching awards, and participation in teaching conferences. For student evaluations, less emphasis is placed on quantitative scores although they are benchmarked to comparable Department course averages as appropriate. Greater emphasis is placed on the qualitative student evaluations, which should be substantially free of red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom and contain a preponderance of positive comments.

For tenure, it is expected that the faculty member will have met the minimum norms described above and lack any of the unsatisfactory indicators, and will have established a sustained record of effective teaching, exhibiting a diverse range of indicators described above.

**Research:** The faculty member is expected to establish a sustained independent program in research/creative activity. The two primary indications of research/creative productivity normally are peer-reviewed publications and external funding.

A sustained and significant record of peer-reviewed publications is expected. Typically, an average of at least one refereed publication per year (or equivalent) is expected, but the value of the published work will be judged based on such criteria as the journal's impact factor, the role of the faculty member in the published work (e.g. as described in the candidate's research statement), the length of the article, the number of citations received, and the expected impact of the candidate's body of work on the field. Normally, publications, either published or in press, will count toward this total only if the candidate uses a BGSU affiliation and has had a major role in the work.

External funding sufficient to establish and maintain a productive and sustained research program is a clear goal. For tenure, external funding that represents significant progress toward that goal is normally expected. The candidate must have made sustained and continuing attempts to obtain funding while not funded and to maintain funding when funded. External funding is defined here to consist of any support from outside BGSU that contributes to and advances the candidate's scholarly production. This can consist of funding from government, business, foundation, or other agencies, as well as in-kind support such as donated equipment or software or time granted at an external facility. In the case when

funding is not secured during the probationary period, the candidate should provide evidence of substantial, sustained effort toward obtaining an appropriate level of external support. This evidence may include grant submissions, agency reviews, and communications with the program officer, for example.

External letters of evaluation from individuals in the candidate's area of professional expertise will be used to provide an overall evaluation of the candidate's research/creative work and its scientific and academic impact and potential, including outreach value where applicable.

Other indicators of research/creative activity and productivity include (but are not limited to):

- research awards (such as named scholarships and grants, career awards, society awards),
- invited and contributed talks on research/creative activity presented at meetings or other universities,
- research/creative collaborations with academic or industrial partners,
- patent applications,
- compiling edited volumes, and
- commercialization and technology transfer.

**Service:** The candidate is expected to compile a record of regularly and effectively serving the needs of the Department, College, and/or University through participation in recruiting and retaining students, and through participation in Department, College, and University committees as assigned or as opportunities arise. In addition to committee work, evidence of service includes the delivery of public science presentations and management, development, and maintenance of facilities used for outreach or other activities of the Department. The candidate is also expected to show evidence of serving the professional community at the local, state, national, or international levels. Evidence may include (but is not limited to) professional refereeing, society offices held, journal editorships, committee service, and hosting conferences and meetings. The candidate is expected to perform service in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload, typically one committee (or equivalent) plus one other significant service activity per year.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the Department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching, research/creative work and service that is appropriate to his or her specific case.

## B. Standards for Promotion

### 1. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

As promotion to Associate Professor is parallel with the granting of tenure, the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those specified for the granting of tenure in Section A above.

### 2. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor



The specific performance criteria for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are described below. The indicators of effective performance are those listed in section A above. Normally a period of at least six years is expected after promotion to Associate Professor before promotion to Professor.

**Teaching:** It is expected that the faculty member will have established a sustained record of effective teaching, exhibiting a diverse range of indicators including overall consistently positive student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching that indicate the faculty member is engaging students in the classroom and teaching the appropriate curriculum, and quantitative evaluations that typically hover around the Department benchmark for comparable courses, significant instructional innovation, course/laboratory/curriculum development and supervising students. The faculty member is expected to achieve excellent performance in multiple of these teaching indicators and to demonstrate teaching leadership at the Department, University, and/or national/international levels, for instance through mentoring other faculty in teaching, leading teaching workshops, presentations at regional or national teaching conferences, textbook authoring, or significant contributions to pedagogy in the field.

**Research:** The faculty member is expected to demonstrate a sustained research program, characterized by continued productivity and development of a national or international reputation. A sustained and significant record of peer-reviewed publications is expected. Typically, at least ten refereed publications (or equivalent) in which the candidate has had a major role since promotion to Associate Professor are expected, but the value of the published work will be judged based on such criteria as the journal's impact factor, the role of the faculty member in the published work (e.g. as described in the candidate's research statement), the length of the article, and the number of citations received. Establishing a significant overall body of work that has an important impact on the field is desirable. Normally, external funding sufficient to maintain a productive and self-sustained research program is expected. Other indicators of research/creative activity and productivity are listed on page 8 above.

**Service:** It is expected that the faculty member will have established a sustained record of substantial service to the Department and to the College and/or University, as well as evidence of serving the professional community. The faculty member is expected to achieve excellent performance in multiple service roles and to demonstrate substantial service leadership, for instance through chairing committees, mentoring other faculty, or initiating important service activities. Service to the professional community should typically go beyond refereeing journal articles to include activities such as serving on grant review panels or editorial boards, or serving on regional or national committees.

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

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall submit a portfolio including a complete, current CV in standard University format, plus the following materials covering the most recent years of service since starting at BGSU or since the candidate's last promotion, not to exceed six years:

- all available student evaluations, including numerical summaries and complete written comments, from courses taught at BGSU in the last six years
- all available (minimum of three) peer teaching evaluations by faculty of higher rank
- a 1-3 page teaching statement
- 3-5 teaching artifacts as identified in the College guidelines
- a 1-3 page research statement
- all substantive publications, including all refereed papers
- a 1-3 page service statement
- up to 5 service artifacts as identified in the College guidelines (optional).

The portfolio shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

To facilitate the preparation of the portfolio, the Chair shall make available to the faculty member peer reviews and student evaluation data (summaries and comments) no later than two weeks prior to the submission deadline for the portfolio.

In addition to the materials listed above, external letters of evaluation from experts in the faculty member's field will be solicited in accordance with the procedures stipulated by the office of the Provost.


The TAPS-A committee shall ensure that all eligible faculty are given access to the candidate's portfolio and shall call a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the promotion and to vote by secret ballot. TAPS-A shall then write a report summarizing the discussion and the vote, and shall circulate the report to the eligible faculty for review a minimum of two days prior to submitting it to the Chair. Eligible voting faculty may submit signed written statements as well as suggested changes to the committee report to the committee chair. The final report, including any submitted statements, shall be submitted in accordance with the review schedule published by the office of the Provost.

Approved by the Department of Physics and Astronomy faculty April 3, 2018.

John B. Laird Date 4/9/18  
John B. Laird, Chair

Approved: Raymond A. Craig Date 4/12/18  
Raymond A. Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Fischer, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 4/17/18

