

SCHOOL OF EARTH, ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIETY
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICIES

General Comments about Evaluation of Faculty

Pursuant to Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), bargaining unit faculty shall be advised by the School Director regarding specific assignment duties and the substantive standards and procedures used in decisions for reappointment (based upon annual performance reviews and enhanced performance reviews), promotion, and tenure. Any additional expectations used by the School shall be brought to the attention of the faculty members, and written copies of these additional expectations shall be readily available upon request. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.1, 6.1.1)

The School of Earth, Environment and Society shall have a written success plan for the professional development of each NTTF and probationary TTF. The School Director shall communicate with the NTTF member to foster achievement and effectiveness in the areas of the NTTF member's assigned responsibilities. Similarly, the School Director shall communicate with the probationary tenure-track faculty member to foster achievement and effectiveness in all areas of teaching, service, and research. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.2, 6.1.2)

The School Director shall provide reasonable advanced notification of upcoming unit, college, or university schedules or deadlines for reappointment, annual performance reviews, enhanced performance reviews, tenure, or promotion. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.3, 6.1.3)

Reappointment Policy: NTTF

A. Policy Development

Non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members shall be reviewed annually for reappointment, in the form of either an annual performance review (APR) or an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with this reappointment policy. The decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of current and previous annual performance reviews (APRs) and/or enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), with emphasis on continuity of favorable performance or a clear record of improved performance. (5.2.1)

The School of Earth, Environment and Society shall have established written policies for annual reappointment of NTTF members regarding: (1) the criteria used for annual performance reviews (APRs) and enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), (2) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews, and (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the reappointment review. (5.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and the Director, subject to endorsement of the Dean. (5.2.2.2)

B. Criteria used for Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews of NTTF

1. NTTF in the School are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contribution.

- a. Teaching – Teaching effectiveness is measured using a combination of student course evaluations, written student comments, peer teaching evaluations, and evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., “average”, “above average”, or “excellent” on the School’s student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. For EPRs, a pattern of improvement over the three-year period is desirable as is evidence that any concerns expressed in previous reviews have been addressed. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Section 5.2.3.1)
- b. Service – Service is evaluated by the degree to which these responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

2. Procedures for creation and submission of APR/EPR documents.

- a. Faculty member shall meet with School Director who outlines the APR/EPR process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Section 5.2.1)) These meetings will occur in advance of the date reviews are due for College review by **2 months for APR, 5 months for EPR**. (Hereafter, boldface times are time prior to the date the dossier and reviews are due for College review.)
- b. The faculty member submits a dossier to the School Director (Article 14, Section 5.2.4.2) **1 month**. The APR dossier should consist of a current curriculum vitae following the standard BGSU template (hereafter referred to only as CV), a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the last APR, a

verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course taught in the preceding year, a peer teaching evaluation for one course in the preceding year, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year. The EPR dossier contents are described in Section E-2.

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

C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

School faculty may amend this reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Director and Dean, to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to NTTF members during existing multiple year terms of annually renewable contracts. (5.2.2.3)

D. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of NTTF (Art. 14, sec. 5.2.3)

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the School Director, in accordance with this reappointment policy. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The faculty member's dossier is reviewed by the School Director who, after consulting with the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, writes an evaluative letter that includes a recommendation on reappointment.
3. The written recommendation of the Director shall be submitted to the Dean and the Provost/VPAA.
4. Prior to submitting the written recommendation to the Dean, the School Director shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the recommendation. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the meeting.
5. The unit's written recommendation regarding reappointment shall be submitted to the Dean. The decision regarding reappointment shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.3 of the CBA.

E. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of NTTF (Art. 14, sec. 5.2.4)

1. Non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who have received appointments for three (3) consecutive years shall be subject to an Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) during the third year of appointment before an additional appointment can be authorized.
2. Enhanced Performance Reviews dossier and timeline

- a. The NTTF member uploads the complete dossier to the University review system. The dossier consists of his/her CV and the following additional supporting materials: a statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy, evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught in the previous three years, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course per semester for each of the previous three years, one peer teaching evaluation for each of the previous three years, a service narrative, supporting service documents, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. **1 month.**
 - b. The School Director makes the dossier available to the Bargaining Unit Members. **1 month.**
 - c. All Bargaining Unit Members meet to discuss the faculty member under review. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the Bargaining Unit Members. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the Bargaining Unit Members holding a higher rank, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the candidate, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
 - d. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. (Article 14, Section 5.2.4.3). **2 weeks.**
3. Initial responsibility for applying established criteria of the School's reappointment policy and making recommendations regarding reappointment following an Enhanced Performance Review rests with the tenured, probationary tenure-track, and non-tenure track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the School who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, who shall make a written recommendation to the School Director.
 4. The Director shall submit the written recommendations of the School faculty to the Dean, accompanied by his/her own written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Director disagrees with the recommendation of the unit faculty, then he/she shall state the reasons for his/her disagreement in writing.
 5. Prior to submitting the School's recommendation to the Dean, the School Director shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the unit faculty and the recommendation from the Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the meeting.

6. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the School, the Director's recommendation, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the faculty of the School, the Director's recommendation, and the college-level review committee's recommendations to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the notification of the Dean's recommendation.
7. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or nonrenewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
8. The decision to reappoint the faculty member, upon the completion of the Enhanced Performance Review, shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.3 of the CBA.
9. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the academic unit, the Director, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the VPAA determines that a non-tenure track faculty member is not performing satisfactorily, the University shall give written notice of its intention to nonrenew the employment of the affected Bargaining Unit Faculty Member and the reasons for the decision to nonrenew shall be specified, with a copy sent to the BGSU-FA.

Promotion Policy: NTTF

A. Eligibility

Promotion in rank is based upon performance. A non-tenure-track faculty member may request an evaluation for promotion based upon: (1) the criteria for such rank (Article 14, section 3 of the CBA), (2) academic unit policies, and (3) the academic achievements of the NTTF member.

Instructors are eligible to be promoted to Lecturer after six years of experience as a full-time faculty member at BGSU (section 3.2.2.2) and two successful Enhanced Performance Reviews (section 5.2.4). However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member, at the discretion of the administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to six (6) years.

Lecturers are eligible to be promoted to Senior Lecturer typically after six years of experience as a Lecturer at BGSU (section 3.2.3.2) and two successful Enhanced Performance Reviews as a Lecturer (section 5.2.4).

B. Policy Development

The School of Earth, Environment and Society shall have established written policies for promotion of NTTF members regarding: (1) the criteria used for evaluation, (2) the process for conducting and completing the evaluation for promotion, (3) the schedule or deadlines necessary for completing the evaluation and, (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the promotion process. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (5.3.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the Bargaining Unit faculty members of the academic unit and the Director, subject to endorsement of the Dean. (5.3.2.2)

C. Criteria used for Promotion Reviews of NTTF

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

NTTF are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contribution.

- a. Shall have a minimum of a Master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment. (Article 14, Section 3.2.2.1)
 1. For NTTF with greater than 50% teaching assignments in the Department of Environment & Sustainability (ENVS), a terminal degree (Ph.D. or the equivalent) in an appropriate content area is required.
- b. Shall have a minimum of six years of experience as a full-time Instructor at BGSU and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience. (Section Article 14, Section 3.2.2.2) The Instructor may apply during the sixth year of full-time employment for promotion effective at the start of the following academic year. (Memorandum of Understanding, signed 10 December 2014) However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, an Instructor, at the discretion of the administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to the sixth year. (Article 14, Section 5.3.1.1)
- c. Teaching – Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., “average”, “above average”, or “excellent” on the School's student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom. A trend of improvement

in the metrics over the years is desirable as is a plan for professional development. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Section 5.3.2.1)

- d. **Service** – Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

NTTF are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contribution.

- a. Shall have a minimum of a Master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment. (Article 14, Section 3.2.2.1)
 - 1. For NTTF with greater than 50% teaching assignments in the Department of Environment & Sustainability (ENVS), a terminal degree (Ph.D. or the equivalent) in an appropriate content area is required.
- b. Shall typically have a minimum of six years of experience as a full-time Lecturer at BGSU and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience (Article 14, Section 3.2.3.2). The Lecturer may apply during the sixth year as Lecturer for promotion effective at the start of the following academic year. (Memorandum of Understanding, signed 10 December 2014)
- c. **Teaching** – Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be better than average (e.g., “above average” or “excellent” on the School's student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom. A trend of improvement in the metrics since the last promotion is desirable as is a plan for continued professional development. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Section 5.3.2.1)

- d. Service – Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

D. Amendment and Retroactive Application

School faculty may amend this promotion policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Director and Dean, to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, changes in the criteria for promotion may not be applied retroactively to NTTF members during existing multiple year terms of annually renewable contracts. (5.3.2.3)

E. Process for Creation and Submission of Promotion Materials

1. School Director informs potential candidates of the opportunity to apply for promotion. Those who wish to be considered for promotion respond to School Director. **7 months.**
2. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Section 5.3.2.1) **5 months.**
3. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier to the University review system. **1 month.**
 - a. The dossier should consist of a current CV, a statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy, evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course per semester, one peer teaching evaluation for each year, a service narrative, supporting service documents, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year Teaching data should be provided since hire or from the time of the last promotion.
4. The School Director makes the dossier available to Bargaining Unit Members. **1 month.**
5. Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the Bargaining Unit Members. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the Bargaining Unit Members holding a higher rank, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the candidate, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**

6. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

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

F. Process for Evaluation of NTTF Promotion Request (Art. 14, sec. 5.3.3)

1. A request by a NTTF member for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the School.
 - a. The School's eligible voters for a non-tenure-track faculty member applying for promotion shall consist of all tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the School and all non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of higher rank in the School.
 - b. If the School has fewer than three eligible voters, the dean of the college shall appoint BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members holding rank higher than the applicant for promotion, from related disciplines outside the School, with the consent of the School's voting eligible faculty and the Director. Such appointments will be made so as to maintain the integrity of the discipline.
2. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding promotion rests with the School's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Director.
3. The Director shall submit to the Dean the written recommendation of the academic unit's eligible voters accompanied by his/her own written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Director disagrees with the unit's recommendation, then he/she shall state his/her reasons for the disagreement in writing
4. Prior to submitting the School's recommendation to the Dean, the School Director shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the School faculty and the recommendation from the Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the meeting.
5. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the School, the Director's recommendation, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the faculty of the academic unit, the Director's recommendation, and the college-level review committee's recommendations to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the notification of the Dean's recommendation.

6. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending promotion to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
7. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the faculty member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. The faculty member has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing his or her Director, Dean, and Provost/VPAA, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has exercised his or her right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for promotion.
8. An affirmative vote of a majority of the academic unit's eligible voters (as defined in 5.3.3.1.1 of the CBA) shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Bargaining Unit Faculty Members eligible to vote have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

Reappointment Policy: TTF

A. Policy Development

Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed annually in the form of either an annual performance review (APR) or for reappointment in an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with the academic unit's reappointment policy. The decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of current and previous annual performance reviews (APRs) and/or enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), with emphasis on satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion (if applicable). (6.2.1)

The School of Earth, Environment and Society shall have established written policies for reappointment of probationary faculty members regarding: (1) the criteria used for annual performance reviews (APRs) and enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), (2) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews and, (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the reappointment review. (6.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty members lies with the tenured and

tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and the Director, subject to the endorsement of the Dean. (6.2.2.2)

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

The APR and EPR are the primary means for ensuring that a TTF is making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady over the entire probationary period and consistent with criteria for tenure and promotion outlined in the **Tenure and Promotion Policy: TTF** section of this document.

1. **Teaching** – Student course evaluations, written student comments, and peer evaluations should indicate that the faculty member is effective as a teacher and that no consistent problems are evident. If any problems were identified in previous APRs, it should be evident that they were addressed. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Sections 6.2.3.1 for APR and Sections 6.2.4.2 for EPR)

2. **Research** – Research productivity should be consistent with where the faculty is in his/her probationary period. Recognizing that research products often accumulate at an irregular pace during the pre-tenure period, specific criteria are not stipulated for the third-year EPR. However, based on the typical timeframe of the EPR, forty percent of the appropriate tenure criteria listed below may be considered a target for progress toward tenure. Proposal and publication submissions may also be used a measure of progress toward tenure.

3. **Service** – Contribution to Departmental, College, and/or University service should be evident. Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Service to the profession is desirable as it helps enhance and broaden the faculty member's reputation. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload.

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

C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

School faculty may amend the unit's reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Director and Dean. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to probationary tenure-track faculty during their probationary period. (6.2.2.3)

D. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of TTF (Art. 14, sec. 6.2.3)

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the School Director, in accordance with this reappointment policy. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, service,

and librarian effectiveness (if applicable). In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.

2. The following are procedures followed by the School of Earth, Environment and Society:
 - a. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the review process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.3) **2 months.**
 - b. Faculty member submits a dossier to the School Director (Article 14, Section 6.2.2.1) **3 weeks.** The dossier should consist of a current CV, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught in the preceding year, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course taught in the preceding year, a peer teaching evaluation for one course in the preceding year, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year.
 - c. The School Director makes the dossier available to tenured faculty. **2 weeks.**
 - d. The tenured faculty meet to discuss the faculty member under review. Any member not present (see C.4.a) can submit written comments. Following the discussion, a vote is taken for reappointment by written ballot by all eligible voters. The School Director shall be present for the discussion so he/she can use the discussion, along with the vote, in his/her evaluative letter that includes a recommendation on reappointment. **1 weeks.**
 - e. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required for a positive recommendation for reappointment. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Tenured faculty on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
 - f. The School Director reviews the recommendation from the eligible voters and writes an evaluation of the candidate. If the School Director disagrees with the vote, then he/she shall state the reasons for his/her disagreement in the evaluation. (Article 14, Section 6.2.4.3)
3. The review shall be submitted in writing to the Dean and to the Provost/VPAA. Included in the review shall be a statement indicating whether sufficient progress is being made toward tenure and/or promotion.
4. Prior to submitting the unit's written recommendation to the Dean, the School Director shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the unit's

recommendation. In response, the probationary tenure track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the meeting.

E. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of TTF (Art. 14, sec. 6.2.4)

1. Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be given an enhanced performance review at the mid-point of their probationary period. The mid-probationary enhanced performance review shall normally occur during the third year of a probationary appointment. However, in cases where a faculty member has received prior service credit (see Art. 14, section 2.2.1.6 of the CBA), the review shall occur at a time agreed upon by the appointee and the Provost/VPAA.
2. Mid-probationary enhanced performance reviews shall be conducted by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the School. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, service, and librarian effectiveness (where applicable). In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. The School faculty's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the School Director. The following are procedures followed by the School of Earth, Environment and Society:
 - a. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the EPR process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Section 6.1.3) **5 months.**
 - b. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
 - c. The School Director makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
 - d. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank Associate Professor or Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
 - e. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

3. The School Director shall submit the recommendation of the unit faculty to the Dean accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation. If the Director disagrees with the unit faculty's recommendation, he/she should state the reasons for disagreement in writing.
4. Prior to submitting the School's recommendation to the Dean, the School Director shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the School faculty and the recommendation from the Director, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the meeting.
5. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the School faculty, Director, and the recommendation of the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the School faculty, the Director, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of the notification of the Dean's recommendation.
6. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or non-renewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
7. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the School faculty, the Director, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost/VPAA determines that a probationary tenure-track faculty member is not making reasonable progress toward tenure, the University shall give written notice of its intention to non-renew the employment of the affected probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member, and a copy of the notification is sent to the BGSU-FA.
8. A probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who fails to obtain a recommendation for reappointment at the end of the mid-probationary review shall receive a one (1) year terminal appointment at the end of which time, the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member shall be terminated from employment at BGSU.

Tenure and Promotion Policy: TTF

A. Standards for Tenure (Art. 14, sec. 6.3)

1. The probationary tenure-track faculty candidate for tenure who has adhered to professional standards of ethics, the Ohio Code of Ethics Law, and appropriate

professional codes of ethics, shall be granted or denied tenure solely on the basis of the following criteria: attainment of the terminal degree or its professional equivalent, teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative work, librarian effectiveness (where applicable), and service to the University community or profession. (6.3.1)

2. More precise statements of criteria for teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, service, and librarian effectiveness (where applicable) used for the granting or denial of tenure may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the School. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA. (6.3.2)

3. Criteria for Tenure

Tenure requires demonstrated achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service consistent with the role of the faculty in the School. While the faculty member's role in the School may emphasize one domain over another, in no case can achievement in one substitute for its lack in another. Criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service include:

- a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited university (Article 14, Section 3.1.2.1).
- b. Teaching - Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. During the probationary period, faculty should develop and maintain an effective, high quality teaching program in all levels of their teaching. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to: student course evaluations; student written comments; peer teaching evaluations; course syllabi; course assessments; examples of assignments, presentations, labs, or student projects; grants for teaching; curriculum development; letters of recognition; teaching awards; or supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research. Efforts to improve teaching skills and effectiveness in the classroom, such as attending teaching workshops, are expected. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Section 6.5.1) Specific criteria include:
 1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., "average", "above average", or "excellent" on the School's student course evaluation scale) and written comments should be generally positive.
 2. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom.

3. On-going peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and/or reflect teaching excellence during the probationary period.
 4. For faculty in graduate programs, the candidate should be active in the mentoring of graduate students.
- c. Research – Research is central to the mission of the School. Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a responsibility of all faculty members. Because of differing faculty roles in the School, criteria for undergraduate and graduate faculty are different. For all faculty, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same.

Faculty in Undergraduate Programs

Faculty are expected to develop a self-directed research program. The primary evidence for research effectiveness is high quality scholarly, peer-reviewed publications and/or grants. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, institutional outreach, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria include:

1. Publications – a minimum of four (4) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, as judged by external reviewers, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – While submission of proposals for external funding is not a requirement, it is to be encouraged as it benefits the faculty member's research program and reputation in the discipline. An externally funded proposal resulting in an award to BGSU of \$15,000 or more can be substituted for a publication up to a maximum of one (1).
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and

used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

Faculty in Graduate Programs

Faculty are expected to develop a self-directed, externally-funded research program. The primary evidence for research effectiveness is high quality scholarly, peer-reviewed publications and grants. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, institutional outreach, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria include:

1. Publications – a minimum of five (5) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – a minimum of \$25,000 awarded to BGSU from one or more external funding agencies. In recognition of the differences among fields in the School and the difficult funding environment, persistent and positively reviewed attempts at pursuing high-quality funding sources will be considered in meeting this requirement.
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

- d. Service – Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Probationary faculty should show evidence of active participation and contribution in one or more of the following:
 1. Departmental, College, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams.

2. Professional organizations connected to the discipline at the local, state, national and/or international levels.
3. Community service and external activities that draw upon professional expertise.

B. Standards for Promotion (Art. 14, sec. 6.4)

1. Promotion in rank for tenure-track and tenured faculty members is based upon performance. Any faculty member may perform satisfactorily at a given academic rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher one. It also is recognized that a period of time will elapse after a promotion, during which time further promotion is not normally to be expected. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost/VPAA's office. In addition, faculty members whose performance merits consideration for promotion may be invited by the Director to submit credentials for promotion review. (6.4.1)
2. The criteria for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are set forth in Article 14, Section 3. More precise statements of what is expected for promotion under teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, service, or librarian effectiveness (where applicable), may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the School. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA.
3. **Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**
Because promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor normally occurs concurrently with the granting of tenure, the criteria for both are the same and are described previously.
4. **Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**
Promotion to Professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness, sustained scholarly productivity, and substantial service contributions within and external to the University. While the faculty member's role in the School may emphasize one domain over another, in no case can achievement in one substitute for its lack in another. Criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service include:
 - a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited university. (Article 14, Section 3.1.3.1)
 - b. Teaching – Faculty must show clear evidence of excellence and innovation in the classroom in all levels of their teaching. Supervision of student research should be common. Measures of teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to: student course evaluations, student written comments, peer teaching evaluations, course syllabi, examples of assignments, presentations, development of labs, student projects, grants for teaching, curriculum development, letters of

recognition, or teaching awards. Ongoing efforts to maintain or improve teaching skills and effectiveness in the classroom, such as attending teaching workshops, are expected. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (Article 14, Section 6.5.1) Specific criteria include:

1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be better than average (e.g., “above average” or “excellent” on the School’s student course evaluation scale) and written comments should be generally positive.
 2. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom.
 3. On-going peer evaluations should reflect teaching excellence.
 4. Supervision of independent studies, undergraduate and graduate research (non-thesis), or internships should indicate an active involvement in teaching outside the classroom.
 5. For faculty in graduate programs, the candidate should be active in the mentoring of graduate students.
- c. Research - Faculty should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review and have attained a national or international reputation in research/scholarly activity. Because of differing faculty roles in the School, criteria for undergraduate and graduate faculty are different. For all faculty, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same.

Faculty in Undergraduate Programs

1. Publications – a minimum of five (5) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, as judged by external reviewers, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.

2. External funding – a minimum of one (1) external proposal funded since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. An externally funded proposal resulting in an award to BGSU of \$25,000 or more can be substituted for a publication up to a maximum of two (2).
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

Faculty in Graduate Programs

Research excellence is demonstrated by a continuous record of high quality peer-reviewed publications and success in obtaining external funding. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria are:

1. Publications – a minimum of seven (7) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – a minimum of \$25,000 awarded to BGSU from one or more external funding agencies since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric.
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these

activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

- d. Service – Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. In addition to continued routine service contributions, faculty should have made significant contributions in service to the School, College, University, profession, and/or community through a significant and successful leadership role in one or more of the following:
1. Departmental, College, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams.
 2. Professional organizations connected to the discipline at the local, state, national and/or international levels.
 3. Community service and external activities that draw upon professional expertise.

C. Policy Development

The School of Earth, Environment and Society shall have written policies for tenure and promotion for TTF members, regarding: (1) the criteria used for tenure and promotion, (2) the process for conducting and completing tenure and promotion reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing tenure and promotion reviews, and (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the tenure and promotion process. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (6.5.1)

D. Process for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. School Director informs probationary TTF of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made. (Article 14, Section 6.6.2) **7 months.**
2. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the tenure and promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Section 6.1.3) **5 months.**
3. In consultation with the faculty member and the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, the School Director generates a list of potential external reviewers of the faculty member's research record. The faculty member has the right to veto up to three names from the list.

The list should contain a sufficient number of names to ensure that a minimum of three reviews are received. Once the list is finalized, the School Director contacts the potential reviewers to ask if they would be willing to write a review. For those responding affirmatively, the School Director sends a package consisting of the faculty member's CV, research narrative, School policy on tenure and promotion, the faculty member's workload allocation, and five representative examples of the faculty's research productivity selected by the candidate, along with instructions for completing the review. **5 months.**

4. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
5. The School Director uploads the external review letters and makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
6. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank Associate Professor or Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
7. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

Promotion to Professor

1. School Director informs potential candidates of the opportunity to apply for promotion. Those who wish to be considered for promotion respond to School Director. **7 months.**
2. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. (Article 14, Section 6.1.3) **5 months.**
3. In consultation with the faculty member and the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, the School Director generates a list of potential external reviewers of the faculty member's research record. The faculty member has the right to veto up to three names from the list. The list should contain a sufficient number of names to ensure that a minimum of three reviews are received. Once the list is finalized, the School Director contacts the potential reviewers to ask if they would be willing to write a review. For those responding affirmatively, the School Director sends them a package consisting of the faculty member's CV, research narrative, school policy on tenure and promotion, the faculty

member's workload allocation, and five representative examples of the faculty's research productivity selected by the candidate, along with instructions for completing the review. **5 months.**

4. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
5. The School Director uploads the external review letters and makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
6. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank of Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
7. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

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

E. Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Recommendations (Section 6.5)

1. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion rests with the academic unit's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Director.
2. The Director shall submit the recommendation of the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and his or her written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation to the Dean. If the recommendation of the Director differs from that of the academic unit's tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, this recommendation of the Director shall state the reasons for the difference. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Dean. In response, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of notification.
3. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Director, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with and the written recommendations of the academic unit, the

Director, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within two business days of notification.

4. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending approval or disapproval to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
5. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the TTF member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. Except for the tenure and promotion to associate professor evaluation occurring during the last year of the probationary appointment, the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing his or her Director, Dean and Provost/VPAA, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for tenure and/or promotion.

F. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Art. 14, section 6.6)

1. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. Probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall be advised of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made and shall be given the opportunity to submit material that they believe to be pertinent to a decision.
3. Probationary tenure-track faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the period of probationary service, and denial of an early request for tenure shall have no effect on subsequent applications for tenure within the probationary period.
4. A probationary tenure-track faculty member in the last year of probationary appointment, or who presents him/herself for tenure and promotion at an earlier date, shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit (Section 6.6.5), and there shall be a single vote of recommendation for or against tenure and promotion to associate professor shall be made.
5. The academic unit's eligible voters shall consist of those Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are tenured and are at or above the rank of associate professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.

6. An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure and promotion to associate professor be granted. Promotion to the rank of associate professor during the probationary period requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of all eligible voters in the academic unit because such action constitutes immediate tenure. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at or above the rank of associate professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
7. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member is a tenured assistant professor, the faculty member will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor independently of an application for tenure. In such cases, an affirmative vote of a majority of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
8. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member begins employment at BGSU as an associate professor without tenure, the faculty member may apply for tenure independently of an application for promotion. In such cases, an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

G. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor (Art. 14, section 6.7)

1. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. A tenure-track or tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who presents him/herself for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the School.
3. The academic unit's eligible voters for candidates applying for promotion to professor shall consist of tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are at the rank of professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members holding the rank of professor from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.

- 4. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at the rank of professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion to professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

Approved by the School of Earth, Environment and Society

Chair/Director Jeffrey B. Snyder Date 21 August 2015

Reviewed by the Dean ZA Cray Date 25 Aug. 2015

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

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost [Signature] Date 26, Aug 2015

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