Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review

Workshops 2017
Review basics: governing documents & principles

- Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): Article 14 (language on appointment, rank, review)
- Unit Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion policy document(s).
- Peer review and administrative review at both unit and college level.
- Transparent process, policy-grounded recommendations.
Review basics: process overview

- Solicitation and reception of external reviews (only for TTF tenure and promotion)
- Assembly of materials, uploading to electronic dossier (eRPT system). Chair “shall provide reasonable advanced notification” regarding deadlines (CBA). See campus-wide deadline schedule (http://www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html)
- Dossier review and vote/recommendation by all eligible BUFMs; separate recommendations from eligible BUFMs and from unit chair/director.
- College-level review and recommendations: PTRC, Dean. (New PTRC model starting 2017-2018.)
- Provost’s review and recommendation.
- Recommendation by President & Board of Trustees.
- For promotion, standard review period is all years since hire or last promotion. For EPR, standard review period is the previous two academic years (TTF EPR, NTTF EPR 1-3) or previous three academic years (NTTF 4+).
Eligible Voters

- Tenure & promotion to associate professor: all tenured faculty vote, two-thirds majority required. (CBA Art. 14, sections 6.6.5-6).

- Promotion to professor: only full professors vote, simple majority required. In units with fewer than three full professors, the Dean shall appoint a committee of full professors from related disciplines, with the consent of tenured unit faculty and chair. (14.6.7.3)

- TTF EPR: all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.6.2.4.2)

- NTTF promotion: NTTF of superior rank and all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.5.4.3.1.1)

- NTTF EPR: NTTF of superior rank, probationary TTF, and all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.5.2.4.3)

- Vote should precede drafting of unit-level faculty recommendation. Faculty recommendation memo should convey result of vote.

- Eligible voters on leave; recusal vs. abstention.
Key Dossier Contents

- Unit RPT document
- CV in BGSU format. For research & creative work, adhere carefully to the documentation standards of your discipline.
- Narratives and supporting materials: Teaching, Research/Creative Work (TTF only, as a general rule), Service
- External reviews (only for tenure/promotion to associate and promotion to professor)
- Previous annual evaluation letters (chair/director and dean), reappointment letters (c/d, dean, provost; candidates for professor: use your tenure letters)
- Recommendation by unit faculty, including result of eligible BUFM vote (may be authored by designated committee)
- Recommendation by chair/director
eRPT Folders

- Unit P&T document
- Curriculum Vitae
- Teaching Narrative
- Peer Evaluations of Teaching
- Quantitative Teaching Scores
- Qualitative Teaching Scores
- Other Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (learning activities, awards, outcomes/assessment work, etc.)
- Service Narrative
- Relevant Supporting Service Materials
- Research Narrative
- External Review Letters & CVs
- Explanation of External Reviewer Selection Process
- Examples of Scholarly/Creative Work
- Annual Performance Evaluations
- Previous Reappointment Letters
- Unit RPT Committee Recommendation
- Unit Head Recommendation
- Appendix
- Rebuttals
- College RPT Committee Recommendation
- Dean Recommendation
- Provost Recommendation or Decision
Teaching Materials

- Narrative (max 3 pages): philosophy, professional evolution, future goals.
- Quantitative evaluation scores from all courses in the review period, presented in comparative context.
- Qualitative student comments. Recommendation: all courses in the review period. Minimum: three courses. Three or more substantive peer reviews of teaching.
- Further evidence of teaching achievement and commitment to student success: well-crafted syllabi, examples of teaching innovation, curricular review/development, work on outcomes and assessment, teaching awards, significant professional development.
- Use the narrative to describe your trajectory and highlight signal accomplishments, with appropriate reference to unit policy.
Student evaluation data

- Candidate and chair/director should work together to assemble evaluation set: all numerical scores and qualitative comments from the review period.
- Chair/director should present quantitative data in comparative context.
- Upload evaluation instrument(s) as well.
Student questionnaires are distributed and collected late in the semester for all courses. Respondents are assured that instructors may not view their evaluations until after grades are submitted; the instructor assigns a student to collect completed evaluations and to return them to the General Studies Writing office. Questions 1-8 evaluate instructor performance. There is no corresponding numerical value for question 9. However, it provides qualitative feedback on the course and/or instructor’s strengths and weaknesses. Questions 1-8 are as follows:

- The degree to which your instructor prepared you to write your major papers
- The usefulness of your instructor’s assignment sheets/handouts
- The helpfulness of your instructor’s explanations and examples
- The degree to which your instructor allowed you to ask questions and express opinions
- The value of one-on-one time during class, conferences, email, phone calls
- The effectiveness of your instructor’s feedback regarding your writing
- The degree to which your instructor helped to improve your writing abilities
- The overall rating of the instructor based on class atmosphere, instructor preparedness, knowledge of material and enjoyment of teaching
- Instructor strengths and weaknesses and suggested changes for the course/instructor

In the grid below, the course number is listed in the left column, with the number of students who completed the evaluation indicated in parentheses. The instructor’s scores for questions 1-8 can be read from left to right, with the General Studies Writing Program’s average score response for undergraduate courses listed in parentheses below each score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100E</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #16: Overall Rating of Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor Mean</th>
<th>Cohort Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>PHYS 3600</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 1010</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 4000</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 1940Q</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ENVS 1940Q</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>PHYS 3600</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
- Cohort mean divided into two groups: 1000 level and 3000/4000 level.
- 5 = Excellent, 1 = Poor

Blue = instructor
Red = cohort
Peer reviews of teaching

- Should be a substantive evaluation, not a description of activities.

- Who is an appropriate peer? Ideally, a colleague of superior rank and experience, but not a supervisor. If your unit pool is limited, consider colleagues from related disciplines or colleagues of equal rank.

- Suggest a pre-classroom visit with instructor; discuss syllabus and pedagogical approach.

- Review should address how the material is taught as well as what is being taught.
Research/Creative Materials

- Narrative (3 pages): Describe your scholarly/creative agenda & trajectory, highlight signal achievements.
- Substantive publications from review period. Use the narrative to direct reviewer attention to key contributions.
- Evidence of external funding activity.
- External reviews and reviewer CVs, explanation of reviewer selection process (chair/director organizes).
- Full professor cases: assessment of quantity should focus on record since tenure, evaluation of quality should consider entire body of work.
- NTTF appointments typically do not entail research/creative duties.
Research/Creative Work Narrative

- Describe and contextualize your work in language that is accessible to readers outside your field.
- Provide a sense of scholarly/creative trajectory. Tenure candidates are expected to demonstrate an independent program of scholarship/creative work.
- Provide evidence that your work is valued in the discipline.
- Tenure candidates “shall have demonstrated ability to do scholarly work, as indicated by publications…” (14.3.1.2.3); candidates for professor “shall have an established reputation within the discipline…” (14.3.1.3.3).
- Make appropriate reference to unit policy criteria.
External Reviews
Only for tenure, promotion to associate & promotion to professor

- Gather input from candidate, faculty, chair. Initial list should be free of conflicts of interest. Keep “arm’s length” principle in mind.
- Generate an initial list of 15+. Start early. We are looking for reviewers from peer or aspirant institutions and programs. Exceptions only if warranted by the research/creative profile of the prospective reviewer.
- Candidate should be allowed up to three vetoes with no questions asked.
- NO DIRECT CONTACT between candidates and prospective reviewers during review process.
- See A&S informational PDFs for sample solicitation letters.
Service Materials

Service Narrative (1–2 single-spaced pages)

☐ State your philosophy of service.

☐ Describe service activities and your contributions to the department, college and university.

☐ Include service to groups on campus or to the community—as long as these involve your academic expertise.

☐ Include service to your profession (professional society or organization).

☐ Indicate some service goals for the future.

☐ Make appropriate reference to unit policy.

☐ Include relevant supporting materials (e.g., letters of acknowledgment or other documentation)

☐ Service expectation is greater for promotion to senior lecturer or full professor. Service leadership can provide a good distinction.
FAQs

- Who exactly needs external reviews?
- What do candidates for full professor do about annual reviews and reappointment letters?
- Is my case governed by old or new unit policy?
- If I am scheduled for NTTF EPR and I also want to pursue promotion, do I have two dossiers?
- What are rebuttals?
- What are some good rules of thumb for CVs?
Questions / more info

Ted Rippey (theodor@bgsu.edu)
Chris Bloomfield (cbloomf@bgsu.edu)
702 Admin
372-2017

A&S web site, Faculty/Staff page
http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html