Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Cultural and Critical Studies

I. **Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of QRF in Years One-Six**

A. Annual Performance Reviews
Annual performance will be assessed by the School Director, who will consider the teaching effectiveness of the QRF and the QRF's participation in service activities. Teaching effectiveness will be assessed using several indicators, including but not necessarily limited to quantitative and qualitative student teaching evaluations and peer evaluations. Successful candidates will demonstrate strong teaching effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time. Indicators of strong teaching effectiveness are: quantitative evaluations that are comparable with or exceed departmental averages; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; and peer evaluations that are generally positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. For instructors whose quantitative evaluations are not comparable with or are below departmental means, the School Director 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 their position, the School Director will provide substantive guidance on how the QRF can improve their performance. Dependent on performance and consistent with the CBA policy, the Director may recommend nonrenewal. Successful candidates must also demonstrate active, meaningful and substantive participation in governance. Active participation in governance can be demonstrated by participation in at least one school/department/program committee, activity, or equivalent in year 1 as well as in year 2, and participation in at least 2 committees, activities, or equivalent in each of years 4 and 5 including one at the school/department/program level.

B. Enhanced Performance Reviews
Enhanced Performance Review criteria largely parallel those guiding APRs, but span a multi-year review period and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. QRF will not only be evaluated on their student evaluations and peer classroom evaluations but also on the substance of their teaching and service narratives and supporting materials. Successful candidates must demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Specifically, successful candidates will have quantitative evaluations that are comparable with or exceed departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; and peer evaluations that are generally positive. In addition, successful candidates will have implemented course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, etc.) that reflect a rigor appropriate to the level of the courses and are aligned with the

department's curriculum. QRF must also demonstrate active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance. Active participation in governance can be demonstrated by participation in at least one school, department, or program committee in years 1-3. In years 4-6, active participation in governance can be demonstrated by participation in at least one school, department, or program committee, and at least one additional service commitment such as serving on a college or university committee, serving a community organization in their role as a scholar/teacher, or the equivalent. Regional or national level service is desirable but not required. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. In developing credentials for reappointment, candidates (with the assistance of the School Director) should attempt not only to substantiate the fact that service has been accomplished but also to assemble a record which reflects upon and explains the quality of service.

II. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF APR and EPR Materials

The Chairs/Directors of ACS, ETHN, POPC, and WS shall help coordinate annual peer teaching reviews.

A. QRF APRs:
QRF will submit APR materials to the School Director. Files must cover the full review period and must include the following items:

1. Updated curriculum vitae in BGSU format;
2. List of courses taught, with enrollments; and
3. One substantive (i.e., evaluative and analytical, not merely descriptive) peer review conducted since the faculty member's last performance review (APR/EPR), performed by another faculty member of higher rank, preferably from within the faculty member's department/program/School.

For APRs, the School Director will review all qualitative and quantitative evaluations for courses taught since previous APR.

B. QRF EPRs:
QRF will upload EPR materials to their dossier on the appropriate online faculty portfolio system. The materials submitted by the candidates for their EPR shall be reviewed by the eligible faculty members in the School of Cultural and Critical Studies. Candidates will be evaluated in relation to the programs/departments to which they contribute. Files must cover the full review period and must include the following items.

Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) documentation for the School of Cultural and Critical Studies shall include:
1. Updated curriculum vitae in BGSU format.
2. Annual Performance Review evaluation letters from the Director for review period.
3. The Teaching section of the dossier *requires*:

a. A teaching narrative (maximum of 3 single-spaced pages) describing the candidate's philosophy and pedagogical methods during the period of evaluation. The teaching narrative must explain how the candidate's teaching accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for renewal and how artifacts in the teaching section of dossier demonstrate that claim.

b. Three substantive (i.e., evaluative and analytical, not merely descriptive) peer teaching reviews from within the period of evaluation, performed by another faculty member of superior rank, preferably from the faculty member's department/program/School;

c. Student evaluation scores (quantitative data) for all courses taught at BGSU during the review period, a sample of the evaluation form used, and a memo from the School Director contextualizing the scores in relation to other faculty in the School [all student evaluations and School Director's memo are uploaded to the dossier by School Director or designated School staff member]; and

d. All qualitative student evaluations for at least three courses taught during the evaluation period including a BGP course or largest course taught across review period. [Faculty member selects qualitative evaluations, but School Director or designated School staff member uploads them to dossier].

e. In order to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, candidates should include at least three sets of additional materials. Typically, each set of will include multiple examples. Examples of appropriate materials include, but are not limited to:

    i. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (including unsolicited student letters, teaching awards or nominations, development of new courses, sample syllabi, sample assignments, etc.);

    ii. Evidence of teaching-related professional development (pedagogy workshops, technology training, etc.);

    iii. Contributions to curriculum or student learning (such as participation in School- or college-level curriculum or assessment committees, web-delivery development, planning co-curricular student events, advising and fostering undergraduate research, advising student groups, or service-learning projects, etc.); and

    iv. Presentations or publications about teaching (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning).

4. The Service section of the dossier *requires*:

a. A service narrative (1-2 single-spaced pages) describing the candidate's philosophy, evidence of accomplishments during the period of evaluation, and relevant supporting materials. The service narrative must explain how the candidate's service accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for renewal and how artifacts in the service section of dossier demonstrate that claim.

      b. In order to demonstrate active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance, candidates should select appropriate additional materials for inclusion in the dossier. Examples include, but are not limited to:
   - i. Emails or letters showing appointment to program, department, school, college, university, discipline, or community organization (related to disciplinary or interdisciplinary area);
   - ii. Documentation of service contributions other than committee work, such as working with student organizations, moderating sessions at conferences, etc.; and
   - iii. Letters from colleagues, advisees, or students assessing your service contributions.

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

5. If faculty member's terms of appointment include a research component, the Research section of the dossier requires:
   - a. A narrative (1 single-spaced page) describing the candidate's research during the period of evaluation.
   - b. Evidence of research productivity including at least two of the following: refereed publications, grant proposals and/or awards, conference papers, research presentations, etc.

III.   **Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF APR Process**

APRs of QRF are conducted by the School Director in accordance with the unit's criteria. Neither the School of Cultural and Critical Studies Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee nor the SCCS faculty are involved in the QRF APR process.

IV.   **Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in QRF Promotion Review**

A. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor

Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor is not automatic. It is based on teaching quality and service contribution. The policy for promotion described in this document applies to all QRF being considered for promotion in the School and its departments/programs: American Culture Studies, Ethnic Studies, Popular Culture, and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

Candidates for promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor must:
1. Hold a Master's Degree in appropriate field. However, the School of Cultural and Critical Studies strongly prefers that all candidates to QRF-Associate Professor hold a Doctoral Degree or other terminal degree in an appropriate field.

2.   Have taught in the School and/or one of its departments/programs full-time for typically at least six years, whether continuously or non-continuously.

3.   Provide evidence of successful and rigorous teaching effectiveness in the School of Cultural and Critical Studies, American Culture Studies Program, Ethnic Studies Department, Popular Culture Department, and/or Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program (including quantitative evaluations that are comparable with or exceed departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; peer evaluations that are generally positive; and additional evidence they are making meaningful contributions to the school's teaching mission). Candidates will be evaluated in relation to the learning outcomes of the programs to which they contribute.

4.   Demonstrate commitment to the improvement of their teaching. Evidence of commitment to improvement may include: introduction of curricular changes (new courses and other formal curricular changes); modifications and expansions of existing courses such as arrangement of new internship opportunities, new syllabi, elaboration of new assignments, adjustment of an existing course for online delivery, integration of community engagement and service learning activities into existing classes; participation in learning communities, conferences and workshops, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources and/or other methods to promote active student learning.

5.   Demonstrate capacity to successfully teach the variety of introductory, general education, and/or upper-level courses the faculty member was assigned. This may be demonstrated by providing evidence of teaching effectiveness of courses taught at various levels.

6.   Provide evidence of their regular fulfillment of various responsibilities to the program/department/school and their active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance. This participation should include active membership on at least one school/department/program committee, and at least two additional service commitments per year. Additional service commitments may be serving on a college or university committee, serving a community organization in their role as scholar/teacher, serving a professional organization, or the equivalent.

B. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor

Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor is not automatic. It is based on teaching quality and service contribution. The policy for promotion described in this document applies to all QRF-Associate Professors being considered for

promotion at the School level and/or in the following departments/programs: American Culture Studies, Ethnic Studies, Popular Culture, and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

Candidates for promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor must:

1. Hold a Master's Degree or other terminal degree in an appropriate field. However, the School of Cultural and Critical Studies strongly prefers that all candidates for Teaching Professor hold a Doctoral Degree or other terminal degree in an appropriate field.

2. Have taught as QRF-Associate Professor in the School and/or one of its departments/programs full-time for typically at least six years, whether continuously or non-continuously.

3. Provide evidence of successful and rigorous teaching effectiveness in the School of Cultural and Critical Studies, American Culture Studies Program, Ethnic Studies Department, Popular Culture Department, and/or Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program (including quantitative evaluations that are comparable with or exceed departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; peer evaluations that are generally positive; and additional evidence they are making meaningful contributions to the school's teaching mission). Candidates will be evaluated in relation to the learning outcomes of the programs/departments to which they contribute.

4. Demonstrate commitment to the improvement of their teaching. Evidence of commitment to improvement may include: introduction of curricular changes (new courses and other formal curricular changes); modifications and expansions of existing courses such as arrangement of new internship opportunities, new syllabi, elaboration of new assignments, adjustment of an existing course for online delivery, integration of community engagement and service learning activities into existing classes; participation in learning communities, conferences and workshops, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources and/or other methods to promote active student learning.

5. Demonstrate capacity to successfully teach the variety of introductory, general education, and/or upper-level courses the faculty member was assigned. This may be demonstrated by providing evidence of teaching effectiveness of courses taught at various levels.

6. Provide evidence of their regular fulfillment of various responsibilities to the program/department/school and their active, meaningful, and substantive participation in the governance. This participation should include active membership on at least one

school/department/program committee and at least two additional service contributions per year. Additional service commitments may be serving on a college or university committee, serving a community organization in their role as scholar/teacher, serving a professional organization, or the equivalent.

7. Demonstrate exemplary initiative in teaching. Examples of activities that demonstrate exemplary initiative include leading curricular revisions, organizing and leading teaching workshops, leading a faculty learning community focused on teaching, receipt of teaching awards, expansion/enhancement of internships or other forms experiential learning, significant contributions to improving learning outcomes assessment practices, teaching mentorship, innovation and improvement of one's own teaching that serves as a model for instructional development in the School.

8. Demonstrate leadership in service. Examples of activities that demonstrate leadership include chairing a committee, leading a faculty learning community, organizing a major event, serving as Director of Undergraduate Studies, serving in School administrative roles, serving in a professional organization, and leadership in a community organization/project where they served in their role as scholar/teacher.

V. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF Promotion Materials

Candidates for promotion are responsible for preparing dossiers that present their accomplishments within the context of the standards and mission of the School of Cultural and Critical Studies. The core of the file shall focus on the candidate's philosophies of and accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service. Each section shall include a narrative that provides a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate's career aspirations; explains the principles for selecting evidence of accomplishment included in the section; and mentions any additional evidence not included in full.

The candidates for promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor or from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor will upload their promotion materials to the appropriate online faculty portfolio system. Files must cover the full review period and must include the following items.

1. Updated curriculum vitae in BGSU format.

2. Teaching narrative (maximum 3 single-spaced pages) describing the candidate's philosophy and pedagogical methods. The teaching narrative must explain how the candidate's teaching accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for promotion and how artifacts in the teaching section of dossier demonstrate that claim.

3. All existing quantitative student evaluation scores for courses taught at BGSU (contextualized by School Director in a memo), inserted in a table that lists each

course taught, the semester and year, course title, your mean, course mean (if applicable), and department mean, and a sample of the evaluation form used. Quantitative evaluations and School Director's memo are uploaded to the dossier by School Director or designated School staff member.

4. All qualitative student evaluations for at least three courses taught within the School during the last six years including a BGP course or the largest course taught across the review period. [Faculty member selects qualitative evaluations, but School Director or designated School staff member uploads them to dossier].

5. Syllabi from three distinct courses, demonstrating a range of levels and content if possible.

6. Three substantive (i.e., evaluative and analytical, not merely descriptive) peer reviews completed within the previous six years preferably by multiple faculty members of the candidate's department/program and/or the school. Dual or joint appointed faculty may submit a letter from a unit outside of the School of Cultural and Critical Studies every other year that a peer review is submitted.

7. Candidates should include at least three sets of additional materials for inclusion in the dossier demonstrating they meet the criteria for teaching described in previous section. Appropriate examples include:

   a. unsolicited student letters, teaching awards or nominations, development of new courses, substantial revision of existing courses, etc.; or

   b. evidence of teaching-related professional development (such as pedagogy workshops, technology training, etc.); or

   c. evidence of contribution to the curriculum or student learning (such as participation in university-wide curriculum or retention initiatives, web-delivery development, planning co-curricular student events, assessment committee or curriculum development, contributions to improvement of program outcomes and assessment practices, and/or advising and fostering undergraduate research);

8. Service narrative (1-2 pages) describing candidate's philosophy, evidence of accomplishments, and relevant supporting materials. The service narrative must explain how the candidate's service accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for promotion and how artifacts in the service section of dossier demonstrate that claim.

9. In order to demonstrate active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance, candidates should include at least three sets of additional materials in the dossier. Appropriate examples include, but are not limited to: contribution to department/program, school, college, university, and/or community service (such as records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings,

documentation of significant contributions and accomplishments, testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs; leadership positions held; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; awards and other recognitions). In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. In developing credentials for promotion consideration, candidates (with the assistance of the School Director) should attempt not only to substantiate the fact that service has been accomplished but also to assemble a record which reflects upon and explains the quality of service.

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

The criteria for evaluating tenure-track faculty for the APR and EPR is satisfactory progress towards the requirements for tenure and promotion in the areas of research, teaching, and service (described below in section entitled "**Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review.**").

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 qualitative and quantitative) over the six-year period. Initially, candidates are launching their research careers and thus during the first- and second-year APRs, manuscripts under review or revision are demonstrative of research activity that signals likely research productivity (e.g., publications in peer-reviewed venues). Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), typically 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, such as the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters.

Similarly, successful candidates will evidence strong teaching effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, ultimately showing quantitative student evaluation results that are comparable with or exceed departmental means, receiving student qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning, receiving peer evaluations that are generally positive, and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also show evidence of some involvement in graduate education, such as teaching a graduate class and/or serving on student thesis and/or dissertation committees.

Finally, the scope and level of service engaged in by successful candidates will increase over the six-year period, expanding from solely department/program/school service to later include contributions to the college, university, discipline or community. During years 1 and 2 on the tenure track, successful candidates may only have department/program/school level service. However, by years 4 and 5, successful candidates not only will have contributed active, meaningful, and substantive service at the program/department/school level, but also have contributed service at the college/university level, to the discipline at the regional/national/international level, and/or to the community.

The 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 comparable to or exceed

departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning, receiving peer evaluations that are generally positive, and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission.

Research success shall be indicated by research *productivity* and quality, and must include publication of peer reviewed research. Other examples of research productivity may include creative work representing original research or conceptualization such as documentaries, museum installations, and/or research and creative work presented in non-traditional formats. Faculty undertaking such engaged or digital research and scholarship must develop appropriate methods, reporting of results, and publication of findings in ways that are equivalent to traditional methods of peer review and criticism. In assessing all scholarship (including traditional and digital scholarship), evaluations by academic experts shall be considered probative. Journal/publisher quality is an important factor. Refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Publications prior to hire will be given appropriate consideration, however publications after initial hire are required and will be given greater weight. Manuscripts under review will be considered, and those that have received an invitation to revise and resubmit will be viewed more favorably than those merely under review. Other indicators of research activity of relevance include presentations at regional or national meetings and invited talks. Successful candidates for the EPR typically will have one or more published or in-press peer-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed book chapters, or other forms of peer-reviewed research and/or creative work such as scholarship of engagement, documentaries, museum installations, and/or research and creative work presented in non-traditional digital formats since initial hire and at least one and ideally two or more others under review or in preparation for submission to a peer-reviewed academic venue.

In their EPRs, successful candidates will need to demonstrate active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance that must include contributions to the school/department/program. Active participation in governance can be demonstrated by participation in at least one school, department, or program committee or equivalent per year in years 1-3. In years 4-5, active participation in governance can be demonstrated by participation in at least one school, department, or program committee or equivalent per year, and at least one additional service commitment such as serving on a college or university committee, regional or national level of service to the discipline, serving a community organization in their role as a scholar/teacher, or the equivalent per year. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. In developing credentials for reappointment through their ERPs, candidates (with the assistance of the School Director) should attempt not only to substantiate the fact that service has been accomplished but also to assemble a record which reflects upon and explains the quality of service.

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

A. TTF APRs
TTF will submit materials for the APR to the School Director. Files must cover the full review period and must include the following items.

The TTF Annual Performance Review file should include:
1. an updated curriculum vitae in University format;

2. student quantitative evaluation scores for all courses taught presented in summary format;

3. complete sets of student qualitative evaluation comments for all courses taught since previous APR/EPR;

4. at least one peer review of teaching from the previous year; and
5. all current publications and/or works in progress.

B. TTF EPRs
TTF will upload EPR materials to the appropriate online faculty portfolio system, with the exception of student evaluations and Director's evaluation summary which will be uploaded by School Director or designated school staff member. Files must cover the full review period and must include the following items.

The TTF Enhanced Performance Review file should include:
1. School annual performance reviews from the TPRC, School Director, and the Dean of Arts & Sciences;
2. an updated curriculum vitae in University format;
3. teaching portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 2-to-3 single-spaced, page teaching narrative describing candidate's philosophy, pedagogical methods, and evidence of accomplishments (The teaching narrative must explain how the candidate's teaching accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for reappointment and how artifacts in the teaching section of dossier demonstrate that claim.);
4. student quantitative evaluation scores for all courses taught presented in a table (with a memo from the School Director contextualizing the scores in relation to other faculty in the School) [all student evaluations and quantitative evaluations and School Director's memo are uploaded to the dossier by School Director or designated School staff member];
5. all student qualitative evaluations for at least three courses including a BGP course or largest course taught across review period [Faculty member selects qualitative evaluations, but School Director or designated School staff member uploads them to dossier];
6. at least two syllabi from all courses taught;
7. at least 3 evaluative peer reviews of teaching from faculty of a higher rank;
8. research/scholarly work portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 2-to-3 single-spaced, page narrative statement describing candidate's philosophy and highlighting most significant accomplishments (The research narrative must explain how the candidate's research accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for reappointment and how artifacts in the research section of dossier demonstrate that claim.);
9. all publications and/or works in progress;
10. service portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 1-to-2 single-spaced, page service narrative statement describing candidate's philosophy and evidence of accomplishments (The service narrative must explain how the candidate's service accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for reappointment and how artifacts in the service section of dossier demonstrate that claim.); and
11. relevant materials and evidence which document candidate's service activities.

VIII. Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

The School Director shall make available the materials submitted by the candidates for their APR for review to all tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the School. Tenured school faculty will meet with the School's Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (TPRC) to provide their feedback for the committee's consideration. If tenured school faculty are unable to attend the meeting, they will have the opportunity to submit feedback in writing to the School's TPRC. The School TPRC will review the candidate's credentials and forward a written assessment summarizing the evaluation of the School faculty to the School Director. This written assessment summarizes the evaluation of the School faculty; evaluates the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and their significance and relationship; includes an overall evaluation of candidate's progress toward tenure; and contextualizes its evaluation in terms of the School's allocation of effort for teaching, research, and service and the standards stated in this document. The TPRC will forward its assessment of progress to the School Director. The Director will compose an independent evaluation after review of the materials and the faculty's assessment.

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

A. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The criteria for evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion is demonstrable productivity in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The successful candidate will demonstrate success in teaching, criteria include quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable to or exceed departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; receiving peer evaluations that are generally positive; and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also show evidence of some involvement in graduate education such as teaching a graduate class and/or serving on student thesis and/or dissertation committees. The successful candidate must have a clearly articulated research agenda, be regularly involved in research activity, and demonstrate research *productivity* and quality, including publication of peer-reviewed research. Accomplishments prior to appointment may receive consideration in the context of review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. However, it is expected that candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will demonstrate a substantial record of achievement in teaching, research, and service, since appointment at BGSU. The successful candidate will engage in active, meaningful, and substantive service to the department/program/school and also engage in some service at the college/university level, to the discipline at the regional/national/international level, and/or to the community.

1. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

For tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the School expects faculty to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in undergraduate teaching; graduate teaching and/or advising; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning. Candidates must demonstrate teaching effectiveness through the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses; the teaching of undergraduate courses; the teaching of graduate courses and seminars (if appropriate); membership on committees of theses, dissertations, non-thesis-option-M.A. exams, and/or capstone projects; representative syllabi which demonstrate rigor, the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; at least four evaluative peer reviews of teaching that are generally positive; contextualized student quantitative evaluation scores that compare favorably with departmental and/or course means; student qualitative evaluation comments that indicate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning as set in the School's principles of effective teaching.

It is expected that candidates for promotion and tenure present a strong instructional portfolio which clearly documents (1) effectiveness in the classroom and (2) contributions to the various components of our instructional program as *appropriate to each faculty member's background and training*. The evaluation of instructional effectiveness primarily focuses on instruction in formal courses, but also includes out-of-class instructional support and development. A strong teaching portfolio will offer clear evidence of contributions in both areas. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains records pertaining to their teaching (including quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, evaluative peer reviews of teaching, and documentation of teaching effectiveness). A portfolio demonstrating teaching effectiveness will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. All teaching portfolios for promotion to Associate Professor must include all required items listed under "Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials", 1. (4) on page 20. In addition, they must include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
   Successful candidates will include at least 4 additional indicators of teaching effectiveness from any combination of the following categories:

   a. Undergraduate Teaching
      Given the School's involvement in undergraduate education, it considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a major component of a faculty member's record of teaching. The following indicators will be considered: evidence of student achievements as a consequence of faculty work with students; teaching awards and distinctions; sample syllabi and assignments; self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness and innovations; evidence of teaching activities that support the School's learning outcomes; and unsolicited statements from students concerning preparedness and teaching effectiveness.

b. Graduate Teaching

When appropriate to the faculty member's area of expertise, contributing to the learning of graduate students in the School of Cultural and Critical Studies is an important component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Faculty presenting themselves for tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must be able to demonstrate contributions to graduate programs in the School appropriate to their expertise and career stage. Based upon one's area of research/creative expertise and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, eligible faculty should provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars; serve on committees of theses, dissertations, non-thesis-option-M.A. exams, and/or capstone projects; make appropriate contributions to the recruitment, retention, advising and/or placement of graduate students; and/or administer and/or evaluate comprehensive exams. Additional indicators may include: placement (and other success indicators) of directed students; and record of extramural support secured for graduate students.

c. Instructional Development

School faculty members are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instructional development include: development, review or modification of curriculum within the School; course syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses; conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to broaden and enhance teaching competencies; participation in training, mentorship, and supervision of graduate teaching assistants; incorporation of service learning activities into courses; innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning; development of learning outcomes or assessment practices; participation in interdisciplinary or interdepartmental instructional activities; participation in joint instructional activities with another university or organization; mentoring faculty within the School about teaching and course development; writing grants for the purpose of improving instructional effectiveness; and publications of articles, syllabi, assignments or other materials related to teaching (publications counted in teaching dossier may not also be counted in research dossier).

d. Contributions to Student Learning

Faculty members may make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate such contributions include: mentoring and advising of students; supervision of student internships or co-operative work experiences; inclusion of students in community engagement projects; participation in University initiatives to create a campus-wide learning community; participation in University, college, or unit projects to assess the

effectiveness of teaching and learning including assessment of Bowling Green Perspective courses; advising and fostering undergraduate research; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

3. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work

As a School we acknowledge and value the diverse backgrounds of the faculty in their research pursuits and productivity. Therefore, we encourage and support both single-authored and collaborative research, scholarship, and creative work. In the case of co-authorship or other collaborative endeavors, candidates will be evaluated according to the proportion of their contributions. In these cases of co-authorship, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide an accurate assessment of their contribution to the work. For tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the School expects faculty to be actively engaged in scholarly research/creative activity, deliver papers at national or international scholarly and professional meetings, and to publish that research in appropriate outlets as specified below. During the course of the faculty member's probationary period, the candidate may submit grant applications for external funding to support their research, and/or engage in other scholarly research/creative work.

a. Publications/Presentations/Performances
Publications, presentations and performances are the primary products of any research/creative work and thus central to its evaluation.

The School of Cultural and Critical Studies includes faculty trained in and active in a variety of different academic disciplines and fields. Therefore, multiple disciplinary and interdisciplinary venues will be considered appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise. The quality of the publications as indicated by the quality of the publication outlets, significance of contribution to field, and/or citations review, as well as the number of publications, is of importance.

A faculty member applying for tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor must show evidence of at least one of the following:
(1) One peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph representing original research or conceptualization published by a recognized university press, academic press, or trade publication directed to an audience of scholarly peers (although the audience need not be limited to this group)—evidence could be provided by the peer-review process involved in the selection of manuscripts by the publisher, reviews of the book in scholarly journals, or citations of the book by scholars.

(2) Scholarly articles or peer-reviewed book chapters, comparable in quality and length to a peer-reviewed book or monograph (*typically* 6 articles/chapters). Articles should represent original research or

conceptualization published in peer-reviewed journals or academic books published under the conditions described in 1.

(3) A combination of publications and/or other forms of peer-reviewed research and/or creative work comparable in quality and length to a peer-reviewed book or monograph representing original research or conceptualization. Typically, this would include a total of 6 pieces of scholarship. Of these 4-5 must be scholarly articles or peer-reviewed book chapters, and up to 2 may be other forms of peer reviewed research and/or peer reviewed creative work such as scholarship of engagement, documentaries, museum installations, and/or research and creative work presented in non-traditional digital formats. Faculty undertaking such engaged or digital research and scholarship must develop appropriate methods, reporting of results, and publication of findings in ways that are equivalent to traditional methods of peer review and criticism. In assessing the impact of digital humanities scholarship, evaluations by academic experts shall be considered probative.

In addition to the above forms of publication, which are required, a faculty member may also demonstrate active scholarship through the following:

- editing of scholarly books or special issues of journals composed primarily of articles written by other scholars;
- dissemination of research through the creation of documentary films, museum exhibitions, or other non-print media;
- writing and editing of textbooks;
- dissemination of research through papers and presentations delivered at national or international scholarly and professional conferences and meetings;
- presentation of invited addresses at scholarly conferences, colloquia, etc.;
- organization of thematically-focused conferences for the dissemination of research within the scholarly community;
- serving as editor, editorial board member, and/or managing editor of a scholarly journal;
- publishing the results of scholarship of engagement in appropriate venues; and
- dissemination of research in magazine articles, books, etc. aimed at a general audience.

b. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research or Creative Work
In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support is an important external validation of the quality of research and creative activity. Recognizing that external support for research in the fields of cultural and critical studies is severely limited, the School encourages faculty to seek such support as is available and appropriate to the faculty member's area of

expertise. Unfunded but competitive external grant proposals will be viewed favorably as efforts to obtain external funding. Performance indicators could include: number of grant applications submitted; agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as principal or co-principal investigator for funded projects. The School also recognizes the value of enhancing the level of extramural funding at the university by activities such as membership on review panels of funding agencies (e.g., NEH, Ohio Humanities Council, etc.), serving on committees that encourage external support, or participating in grant proposals or funded projects directed by other faculty members.

c. Institutional Outreach
The School shares the University's commitment to public good and community engagement. Therefore, faculty members may direct their scholarship/creative work to applied and engaged scholarship as well as basic research or creative activity.

d. Reputation within the Field

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/creative work is their reputation within the discipline or field and among community partners in the case of faculty members who have pursued the scholarship of engagement. In the case of tenure and promotion, this quality may be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the unit from authoritative reviewers external to the University.

Additional ways of documenting reputation within the field could include: published reviews of the candidate's scholarly research/creative work; inclusion of reprints of articles or portions of books in anthologies or similar publications; acceptance of papers for presentation at academic conferences or manuscripts for publication (including non-traditional forms of publication such as electronic journals) through a process of peer or expert referee review; awarding of grants to support scholarly activities; citation of scholarship by researchers in their publications; selection as a member of a board or panel responsible for the review of the scholarship of others (press board, journal board, grant review board, etc.); selection as a keynote or featured speaker at academic conference(s); receipt of awards or prizes offered by scholarly associations for outstanding publications or research.

e. In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the School consider other evidence of achievement in research/creative work that is appropriate to their specific case.

4. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness

For faculty seeking tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, a record which documents continuous, active, and effective involvement in service is required.

All candidates for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are expected to perform active, meaningful, and substantive service at the program/department/school level each year. Successful candidates will demonstrate active, meaningful, and substantive participation in governance that must include contributions to the school/department/program.

Service contributions by faculty at the Department/School, College, University, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. The School defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities which fall into three domains: service to BGSU; service to the external community; and service to the faculty member's profession.

In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. In developing credentials for tenure and promotion consideration, candidates (with the assistance of the School Director) should attempt not only to substantiate the fact that service has been accomplished but also to assemble a record which reflects upon and explains the quality of service.

f.   Service to BGSU

These activities include participation in School, department, program, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. School service may include serving on school/department/program committees; serving as library liaison, grade appeals officer, departmental newsletter editor, alumni liaison, involvement in activities to promote unit programs and services to prospective students; chairing a committee, leading a faculty learning community, organizing a major event, serving as Director of Undergraduate Studies, and serving in School administrative roles.

College and University service may include service on any college or university committee including those that monitor, review or modify curriculum; service on an elected College or University council or committee such as Faculty Senate, Arts & Sciences Council, the Arts & Sciences Curriculum, Teaching, & Learning Committee, or the Arts & Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; serving on a search committee outside of the candidate's home academic units. College and University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by

faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. College and university service may also include activities that promote faculty-student interaction and student retention. Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions and accomplishments; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignments; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs; and/or evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others.

g.   Service to the External Community

When appropriate given their areas of expertise, faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. Service to the external community includes participating in public forums, providing expert testimony, consulting, leadership in a community organization/project, and other professional service to the community in which the faculty member engages in their role as scholar/teacher. This may include activities such as data collection and fund-raising. Faculty members are also encouraged to share their professional expertise with the public through participation in interviews and consultations with the news media. To be considered as community service appropriate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion considerations, candidates must demonstrate that such external activities draw on their professional expertise. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but not all such activities are directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used to evaluate community service include: records of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognitions; written statements or testimonials.

h.   Service to the Profession

Service to the profession includes participation in state, national, or international professional organizations (e.g., organizing scholarly conferences, participating in the governance of professional associations and service on association committees), external examining for dissertations and programs, and/or serving as an external reviewer for tenure and promotion cases. These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations

connected to their profession, discipline or field at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service include: documentation of service to appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or extramural funding agencies; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; professional recognitions; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; sessions moderated that contribute to the profession.

    i. In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the School consider other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to their specific case.

B. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The criteria for evaluating faculty for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor are demonstrable excellence and leadership in teaching, sustained productivity and a national/international reputation in research, and significant engagement and leadership in service.

1. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The successful candidate will demonstrate success and leadership in teaching. Criteria for success in teaching includes quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable to or exceed departmental means; qualitative evaluations that demonstrate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning; receiving peer evaluations that are generally positive; and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also show evidence of involvement in graduate education appropriate to the faculty member's area of expertise, their allocation of effort, and assigned duties. Faculty seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor must also demonstrate leadership in teaching.

For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the School expects faculty to show continued demonstration of success in teaching since promotion to Associate Professor through the teaching of undergraduate courses and graduate courses and seminars; chairing committees on theses, dissertations, non-thesis-option M.A. exams, and/or capstone projects; representative syllabi which demonstrate nature of instruction and range of courses taught; at least three evaluative peer reviews of teaching that are generally positive; student quantitative evaluations scores based on the CCS Evaluation Instrument that compare favorably with departmental and course means; student qualitative evaluation comments that indicate effective instruction and point to a level of appropriate rigor, faculty responsiveness, and active learning as set in the School's principles of effective teaching; and teaching leadership which may include innovative curricular development, interdisciplinary collaboration, implementation of evidence-

based teaching practices, and/or the incorporation of high-impact class activities and assignments.

2. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work

For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the School expects faculty to be actively engaged in scholarly research/creative activity and to publish that research in appropriate peer-reviewed outlets as specified below. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor requires new research and publications since the last promotion and dissemination of research through papers at national or international scholarly and professional conferences and meetings. Additional evidence of research productivity may include invited addresses at scholarly conferences, colloquia, etc.; active pursuit of external funding and/or research fellowships; and/or preparation of research reports and policy studies. The body of work produced since promotion to Associate Professor should generally be greater than that required prior to that promotion. The quality of the publications as indicated by the quality of the publication outlets, significance of contribution to field, and/or citations review, as well as the number of publications, is of importance. In the case of co-authorship or other collaborative endeavors, candidates will be evaluated according to the proportion of their contributions. In these cases of co-authorship, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide an accurate assessment of their contribution to their work.

Successful candidates must also demonstrate the impact of their research and have a national or international reputation in their field through outstanding scholarship. The candidate's scholarly reputation may be demonstrated by editing a special issue of a journal composed primarily of articles written by other scholars; publishing articles in high-impact, field-specific journals; editing a series for a university press or academic press; editing an encyclopedia; high-visibility scholarly presentations; appointments to state, national, and/or international commissions based on research expertise; conference sessions devoted to one's work; invitations to contribute essays to journals and/or edited volumes; external metrics for citation counts of scholarship; adoption of texts by other universities; being awarded external funding of $5,000 or more for an individual, group, or University project; their scholarship being recognized by external reviewers; published reviews of the candidate's scholarly research/creative work; inclusion of reprints of articles or portions of books in anthologies or similar publications; selection as a member of a board or panel responsible for the review of the scholarship of others (press board, journal board, grant review board, etc.); selection as a keynote or featured speaker at academic conference(s); and/or receipt of awards or honors offered by scholarly associations for outstanding publications or research.

The successful candidate from Associate to Full Professor must demonstrate research or creative work in one of the three following forms:

        a) One peer reviewed scholarly book or monograph representing

original research or conceptualization published by recognized university presses, academic presses, or trade publications directed to an audience of scholarly peers (although the audience need not be limited to this group)—evidence could be provided by the peer-review process involved in the selection of manuscripts by the publisher, reviews of the book in scholarly journals, or citations of the book by scholars.

        b) Scholarly articles or book chapters, comparable in quality and length to a peer-reviewed book or monograph (*typically* 6 articles/chapters). Articles should represent original research or conceptualization published in peer-reviewed journals or in academic books published under the conditions described in (1).

        c) A combination of publications and/or other forms of peer reviewed research and/or creative work comparable in quality and length to a peer-reviewed book or monograph representing original research or conceptualization. Typically, this would include a total of 6 pieces of scholarship. Of these 4-5 must be scholarly articles or peer-reviewed book chapters, and up to 2 may be other forms of peer reviewed research and/or peer reviewed creative work such as documentaries, museum installations, and/or research and creative work presented in non-traditional digital formats. Faculty undertaking such engaged or digital research and scholarship must develop appropriate methods, reporting of results, and publication of findings in ways that are equivalent to traditional methods of peer review and criticism. In assessing the impact of digital humanities scholarship, evaluations by academic experts shall be considered probative.

3. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness

   For faculty seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, a record which documents active, meaningful, and substantive service to the University and profession since promotion to Associate Professor is required and should include a continuous record of involvement at the School and Department level, active and frequent contributions at the Collegiate and University levels (including active membership on at least two committees at the college/university level) as well as contributions to the profession at large. Service to the community in their role as scholar/teacher is also encouraged.

   All candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor are expected to provide evidence of leadership of major program, department, and School committees and program initiatives since promotion to Associate Professor; leadership on College or University committees and/or leadership on College/University programs; service to the profession which may include holding a leadership role in or active membership on committees of national and/or state professional organizations, refereeing for journals and grant agencies, and/or evaluating manuscripts for university and academic presses.

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

A. Organization, Creation, and Presentation

The candidate for tenure or promotion is responsible for preparing a dossier that presents their accomplishments within the context of the standards and mission of the School of Cultural and Critical Studies. The candidate's credential file should be organized in accordance with the guidelines provided by the College. Redundancy and extraneous materials are to be avoided as much as reasonably practicable. The unit will follow the university-wide guidelines for selecting external reviewers. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be allowed to suggest potential external reviewers.

The core of the file shall focus on the candidate's philosophies of and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly work and service, each of which shall be addressed in separate sections. Each section shall include a narrative that provides a philosophy for understanding how the materials represent the candidate's career aspirations and achievements; explains the principles for selecting evidence of accomplishment included in the section; and mentions any additional evidence not included in full dossier.

The candidate's application for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor must include the following materials for the period under review:

1. Annual Performance Reviews from School Director and annual assessment from the School TPRC (for candidates for promotion to Associate Professor only);
2. Enhanced Performance Reviews from the School TPRC and School Director (for candidates for promotion to Associate Professor only);
3. Tenure and Promotion review letters from the provost, the dean, and unit head (for candidates for promotion to Full Professor only);
4. updated curriculum vitae in BGSU format;
5. teaching portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 2-to-3 single-spaced, page teaching narrative describing candidate's philosophy, pedagogical methods, and evidence of accomplishments (The teaching narrative must explain how the candidate's teaching accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for promotion and/or tenure and how artifacts in the teaching section of dossier demonstrate that claim.); (a) at least three representative syllabi; (b) quantitative student evaluation scores for all courses taught inserted in a table that lists each course taught, the semester and year, course title, candidate mean, course mean (if applicable), and department mean (quantitative ratings must be contextualized by the School Director in a memo) [all student evaluations and quantitative evaluations and School Director's memo are uploaded to the dossier by School Director or designee]; (c) all qualitative student evaluations for at least three courses including a BGP course or largest course taught across review period [all student evaluations and quantitative evaluations and School Director's memo are uploaded to the dossier by School Director or designee]; (d) evaluative peer reviews of teaching obtained during the review period (for tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, at least four peer reviews are required and for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, at least three peer reviews are required); (e) four additional

indicators of teaching effectiveness (for examples, see Criteria and Standards for Promotion sections);

6. research/scholarly work portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 2-3 single-spaced, page narrative statement describing candidate's philosophy and highlighting the most significant accomplishments. The research narrative must describe the candidate's coherent research agenda, explain how the candidate's research accomplishments meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, and explain how the artifacts in the research dossier demonstrate that claim; and all publications since hire (for candidates for tenure and Associate Professor) or since last promotion (for candidates for promotion to Full Professor). The research portfolio may also include additional indicators of research effectiveness (for examples, see Criteria and Standards for Promotion sections);

7. service portfolio of philosophy and accomplishments which includes a 1-2 single- spaced, page service narrative statement describing candidate's philosophy and evidence of accomplishments (The service narrative must explain how the candidate's service accomplishments meet or exceed the criteria for renewal and how artifacts in the service section of dossier demonstrate that claim.); evidence of accomplishments; and relevant supporting materials (for examples, see Criteria and Standards for Promotion sections). In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. In developing credentials for [tenure and promotion consideration], candidates (with the assistance of the School Director) should attempt not only to substantiate the fact that service has been accomplished but also to assemble a record which reflects upon and explains the quality of service.

B. Faculty Review Process in the School of Cultural and Critical Studies

If the candidate has a core affiliation with a department/program within the School, the elected member from that department/program on the School's TPRC committee will call and conduct the meeting of all voting faculty in the School, leading the discussion and spearheading the draft of the faculty letter that reports the vote tally, summarizes the voting faculty's appraisal of the candidate's performance, and conveys the faculty recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion.

Approved by the faculty of the School of Cultural and Critical Studies on February 22, 2021.

Susana Peña
Susana Peña (Mar 18, 2021 09:03 EDT)

 Susana Peña, Director

Approved: _Dale Klopfer_
Dale Klopfer (Mar 24, 2021 22:09 EDT)

 Dale Klopfer, Interim Dean
 College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _Joe B Whitehead Jr_
Joe Whitehead (Mar 31, 2021 10:09 EDT)

 Joe B. Whitehead, Jr.
 Provost and Senior Vice President