

Arts and Sciences Faculty Review Handbook – 2024-2025 Review Cycle

Updated Feb 28, 2024

Contents

- I. Candidate Responsibilities
- II. Unit Responsibilities: Eligible Faculty
- III. Unit Responsibilities: Chair or Director
- IV. College Responsibilities: Faculty Advancement Team
- V. College Responsibilities: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
- VI. College Responsibilities: Dean

Appendices

- A. Review Process: Sequential Overview
- B. Candidate preparatory exercises

I. Candidate Responsibilities

A. Know your policies and guidelines

(For links to these materials see www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html)

1. Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): Article 14
2. Unit Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) policy (clarify: 2006 policy or post-CBA policy), hereafter “unit policy”
3. University guidelines for soliciting external letters of review (if applicable), hereafter “external review guidelines”
4. Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents policy, hereafter “college dossier policy”
5. Arts and Sciences Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180

B. Understand your access

1. Your opportunity to edit and make changes to your dossier concludes once you submit your dossier.
2. Faculty 180 provides viewing access throughout process—except for external reviews.
 - a. You will see recommendations from eligible unit faculty, unit head, the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC), Dean, University Level Review Committee (if applicable), and Provost.
 - b. If external reviews apply in your case and you wish to view external reviews, direct your request to your unit head and/or the college faculty advancement team after the candidate dossier closing date of September 30th. Access will be granted upon request.

C. Know your rights

1. Candidates have the opportunity to respond via rebuttal to unit and college recommendations. The rebuttal window is 3 business days, following the conclusion of the unit stage and the conclusion of the college stage.
2. Candidates have recourse via grievance and arbitration at the conclusion of the review process. See Article 13 and Article 14, Section 11 of CBA.
3. Candidates participate in external reviewer selection process (if applicable).
 - a. Review your unit policy and unit procedures.
 - b. Review the University guidelines for soliciting external letters of review (see external review guidelines).

- c. Be attentive to reviewer and institution profile.
- d. Watch COI.
- e. **Avoid all contact with prospective reviewers** throughout the selection process and your candidacy.
- f. **Candidate-solicited letters of reference or recommendation are not appropriate.**

D. Prepare your dossier

1. “On or before the date that falls one calendar week prior to the candidate dossier closing deadline specified in the university-wide schedule for faculty reviews, candidates shall complete their information entry, post all materials for which they are responsible, certify completeness and accuracy, and submit the dossier to the unit head” (college dossier policy).
2. Principal responsibility for **dossier completeness and accuracy rests with the candidate.**
 - a. Issues with completeness and accuracy will complicate the work of reviewers and raise questions about the legitimacy of your case.
 - b. Misrepresentation of professional accomplishments is in conflict with CBA Article 9, Section 2.
3. Key dossier contents:
 - a. CV in BGSU format (www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/documents/faculty-resources/Standard-BGSU-CV.pdf)
 - b. Unit policy (clarify policy choice if applicable)
 - c. Original appointment letter (“hire letter,” i. e., not your annual salary letter[s])
 - d. Teaching, Scholarly/Creative (if applicable), and Service materials
 - i. Narratives
 - ii. Signature Contributions files
 - iii. Further materials as specified by unit policy and/or college dossier policy
 - e. Previous review letters
 - i. If you are having difficulty locating original appointment and/or previous review letters, contact Chris Bloomfield or the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.
 - ii. See the Arts and Sciences Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180 for specific guidance on previous review letters required for your case.
 - iii. Your annual salary letter is not a review letter. Review letters are **APR** (Unit Head and Dean), **EPR** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost), **promotion** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost), or **tenure** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost) letters.

4. Dossier materials that are handled by unit head or designee
 - a. External reviews (if applicable)
 - b. Student evaluations
5. Your dossier is set up in accordance with the **review period** for your case.
 - a. Do not expect work outside the review period to be credited in the review process—and do not base your case in whole or in part on such work..
 - b. If you have prior service credit, be sure to check in with your chair/director and the faculty advancement team so we can set up your dossier accordingly.
6. Candidates and unit heads: The candidacy and the review process are best served by a **clean, coherent dossier**.
 - a. Follow the Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180 (link in Section A above).
 - b. Ask the College if you have questions about posting location, naming conventions, etc.

E. Your dossier: Teaching

1. Know the applicable policy standards and how your record of achievement meets those standards.
 - a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise (see Appendix B below) to create a framework, and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.
2. Narrative: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions, i.e. further evidence of teaching development and accomplishments: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 7.
 - a. Signature Contributions enable candidates to highlight key accomplishments in an intuitive way in the dossier and improve focus, clarity, and efficiency on reviewer side.
 - b. Assemble your Signature Contributions artifacts in one integral PDF, with a Table of Contents, sequenced in the order that they are discussed in narrative.
4. Student evaluation data: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, points 2 – 5.
5. Peer reviews of teaching: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 6.
6. List further information and post further materials as called for by unit policy.

F. Your dossier: Scholarly/Creative Work (if applicable)

1. Know the applicable policy standards and how your record of achievement meets those standards.

- a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise to create a framework, and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.
2. Narrative: See college dossier policy, Research/Creative Work section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions: Key research/creative contributions that demonstrate the coherence, quality, and impact of the work during the review period, based on discipline-appropriate indicators (e.g., impact factor, h-index, citations, awards, reputation of venue).
 - a. Signature contributions enable candidates to highlight key accomplishments in an intuitive way in the dossier and improve focus, clarity, and efficiency on reviewer side.
 - b. Signature Contributions are usually a subset of the comprehensive set of publications from the review period, but in some instances the comprehensive set and the signature contributions may be the same.
 - c. Assemble your signature contributions documents in one integral PDF, with a Table of Contents, sequenced in the order that they are discussed in narrative.
4. All substantive publications from review period: See college dossier policy, Research/Creative Work section, point 2.
5. Candidates for Professor: Clarify the extent to which any work captured in the review period was considered in the evaluation for tenure. Use the “Description” feature in Faculty 180 to do so. Consult the Associate Dean for Faculty Development as needed.
6. Guidance for QRF candidates who wish to incorporate research and/or creative work in their dossier:
 - a. Frame this work in relation to and in connection with your accomplishments in teaching and/or service.
 - b. Review your unit policy carefully. Some policies have specific language regarding this matter.

G. Your dossier: Service

1. Know the applicable policy standards and how your record of achievement meets those standards.
 - a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise to create a framework, and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.
2. Service narrative: See college dossier policy, Service section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions: The major roles and accomplishments that convey the value and impact of your service work in unit, college, university, professional, and/or community contexts and demonstrate how that service work has met the policy-based standards during the review period.

- a. The balance, type, and setting of the signature contributions in service will vary according to case type and career stage.
 - b. If you have questions regarding documentation of service accomplishments, see college dossier policy, Service section, point 2 and consult the Dean’s Office as needed.
4. List other service information and post other service materials in accordance with unit policy.
5. Candidates for Professor: Clarify the extent to which any work captured in the review period was considered in the evaluation for tenure. Use the “Description” feature in Faculty 180 to do so. Consult the Dean’s Office as needed.

H. Make a cogent, policy-based case

1. The candidate makes the case through
 - a. narratives that reference unit policy standards
 - b. carefully selected and assembled signature contributions files that work in concert with the narratives
 - c. further materials and information as specified by unit and college policies
 - d. complete and accurate dossier assembly
2. The candidate prep exercises will allow you to effectively set the stage for making your case.

II. Unit Responsibilities: Eligible Faculty

A. Know your policies and guidelines

1. Eligible faculty have an obligation to know the applicable language of the contract and the applicable language of the unit policy for the different review types in which they participate.
2. Review applicable language in advance of reviewing dossiers.
3. For links to pertinent policies and guidelines see www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html

B. Fulfill your charge

1. Participate in external reviewer selection process (if applicable), as specified by University external review guidelines and unit policy.
2. Participate as eligible faculty in dossier review and voting: **this is a contractual duty.**
 - a. An **abstention** or a **failure to vote** is tabulated as a **negative vote**.
 - b. For tenure, a 2/3 majority is required. For all other cases, a simple majority suffices.
 - i. Scenario: Professor X is up for promotion. There are 10 eligible voters. 5 vote in favor, 2 vote against, 3 abstain or skip the vote. The faculty recommendation is negative.
 - c. Regarding the possibility of **recusal** due to approved leave, COI, conflict under the Amorous Relationships policy, or other reasons, see pertinent language in CBA Article 14 and consult the College as needed.
 - i. Scenario: Professor Y is up for promotion. There are 10 eligible voters. 5 vote in favor, 4 vote against, 1 is recused due to FIL. Professor Y has just received a positive faculty recommendation.
3. Participate in drafting and finalizing written recommendation, in accordance with unit policy and procedures.

C. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply unit policy standards in your evaluation of the dossier.
2. Focus on the review period.
3. Write a **policy-based recommendation** that cites the policy as appropriate.
4. Document the vote in your recommendation.
 - a. Clarify whether any eligible voters were recused due to approved leave or other reasons.

- b. Report the vote in specific terms (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions).
5. Bear in mind: a candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluation than by vague praise.

III. Unit Responsibilities: Chair or Director

A. Coordinate external review (if applicable)

1. Follow university-wide “External Reviews for Promotion and Tenure” guidelines posted here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
 - a. Be attentive to
 - i. recognized reputation
 - ii. active and influential status
 - iii. requisite rank
 - iv. peer or aspirant institutions
 - b. Avoid COI and appearances of COI.
 - c. Engage candidate and unit tenured faculty in the process as called for.
2. The terminology in the guidelines is geared toward research and scholarship, but the principles apply to creative disciplines as well. If you are an artist, for instance, read “active and influential scholars in the field” as “active and influential artists in the field.”
3. If candidate’s research blends creative work and scholarship and/or incorporates a community-based/scholarship of engagement element, then review pertinent policy language carefully and consult the Dean’s Office as needed regarding external review, dossier prep, etc.
4. Guidelines point 9 refers to the “Dean or designee.” In Arts and Sciences, the Chair/Director serves as the Dean’s designee for this function.
5. External reviews should be on university letterhead, signed/scanned or electronically signed by the reviewer.
6. Posting external reviews:
 - a. Combine reviewer CVs into a single PDF and review letters into a single PDF.
 - b. Unit heads post external reviews after candidate has submitted and before unit faculty review begins.

B. Support, oversee, and play your designated role in dossier preparation

1. See candidate dossier guidance in Part I, Sections D through H above and provide support as needed.
2. Candidate is required by college policy to submit dossier to you “on or before the date that falls one calendar week prior to the candidate dossier closing deadline specified in the university-wide schedule for faculty reviews” (college dossier policy).

3. “The unit head shall post external evaluations (if applicable), review dossier contents, and follow up with the candidate as needed to address any dossier content questions in advance of submitting the dossier for evaluative review by eligible unit faculty members. Principal responsibility for dossier completeness and accuracy rests with the candidate” (college dossier policy).
 - a. If you have concerns about completeness and accuracy, advise your candidate to gather or update materials asap.
 - b. Consult the Dean’s Office as needed, both on how to handle dossier updates and on issues of policy.
 - c. If completeness and accuracy issues persist due to ineffective response or no response from candidate, note the issues in your written recommendation and weigh them appropriately.
 - d. If completeness and accuracy issues rise to the level of intentional misrepresentation, consult the Dean’s Office re: possible responses under the CBA.

C. Guide the unit

1. See eligible faculty responsibilities in Part II above.
2. Provide direction and support as called for. Consult the Dean’s Office as needed.

D. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply unit policy standards in your evaluation.
2. Focus on the review period.
3. Write an **independent, policy-based recommendation** that cites the policy standards in teaching, research/creative (if applicable), and service and explains how the record as captured in the dossier does or does not meet the standards.
4. If the unit faculty recommendation does not do so, then be sure to:
 - a. Clarify whether any eligible voters did not participate due to approved leave or recusal.
 - b. Report the vote in specific terms (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions).
5. Bear in mind: a candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluation than by vague praise.

IV. College Responsibilities: Dean's Office (Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Assistant to the Associate Dean)

A. Guide the Candidates, Chairs and Directors, and PTRC

1. Provide guidance to candidates throughout the RPT process, beginning with preparation workshops in the spring prior to dossier submission, and ending once cases advance beyond the college.
2. Provide guidance to candidates who choose to file a rebuttal to the Chair/Director recommendation or the Dean's recommendation.
3. Provide guidance to Chairs and Directors regarding CBA questions, college policies and practices, and issues with individual cases.
4. Provide guidance to PTRC regarding PTRC guidelines, university-wide guidelines for college-level review committees, application of unit RPT policies, and issues with individual cases.

B. Manage the college-level RPT process

1. Set up and manage Faculty 180 process for submitting and reviewing dossier materials.
2. Ensure process is completed according to the university-level "evergreen" calendar for RPT processes.
3. Assist PTRC with scheduling meetings and accessing materials in Faculty 180.

C. Contribute to process improvement

1. Consider and evaluate the efficacy of college-level policies and procedures.
2. Solicit feedback from PTRC regarding efficacy of process and policies.
3. Suggest and develop changes to the process as warranted.
4. Provide regular RPT workshops for faculty candidates and Chairs/Directors.

V. College Responsibilities: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

A. Be familiar with unit policies and guidelines

1. Committee members have an obligation to know the applicable language of the contract and the applicable language of the unit policies for the different types of faculty review cases in which they participate. The applicable policy document for a given case will be posted in the dossier.
2. Review applicable language in advance of reviewing dossiers.
3. For links to pertinent policies and guidelines, see: www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html.

B. Fulfill your charge

1. Participate in dossier review and voting, as eligible, on all Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), tenure, and promotion cases in the College.
2. Participate in drafting and finalizing written recommendations, in accordance with Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) rules.

C. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply applicable unit policy standards in your evaluation of the dossier.
2. Focus on the review period.
3. Write an **independent, policy-based recommendation** that cites the applicable unit policy as appropriate.
4. PTRC members do not vote on cases from their own units.
5. Document the unit vote, unit recommendation, and unit head recommendation in your own recommendation, and do so in specific terms (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions). Clarify whether eligible voters at the unit level were recused due to approved leave or other reasons.
6. Document the PTRC vote in specific terms (e.g., 4 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 recusal, 0 abstentions).

7. Bear in mind that both the candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluations than vague praise. **Cite specific policy-grounded evidence from the dossier to support your recommendation.**

VI. College Responsibilities: Dean

A. Guide the Associate Dean and the Assistant to the Associate Dean

1. Provide guidance to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Assistant to the Associate Dean regarding any process changes you wish to see, based on the previous cycle.
2. Provide guidance to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Assistant to the Associate Dean regarding any new practices you wish to see implemented for the upcoming cycle.
3. Respond to the team's queries regarding general matters of policy and practice and/or issues with a particular case.

B. Charge the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)

1. Meet with the faculty advancement team and the members of the PTRC at the beginning of the review cycle to
 - a. Discuss PTRC responsibilities (see Section V above) and
 - b. Share your understanding of the purpose and value of PTRC's work

C. Review and recommend, guided by policies

1. Evaluate candidate dossiers in accordance with the CBA, applying the appropriate unit policy standards in each case.
2. Review the recommendations of unit faculty, unit head, and PTRC.
3. Write an independent, policy-based recommendation for each case.

D. Contribute to process improvement

1. Confer with and/or offer feedback to the following groups or individuals at the conclusion of the cycle, in the interest of promoting process improvement from year to year:
 - a. Chairs and Directors
 - b. Assoc Dean, Asst to Assoc Dean
 - c. PTRC
 - d. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Appendix A: Review Process Overview

Process steps

1. Information entry and upload of materials via Faculty 180 on a rolling basis
2. Solicitation and reception of external reviews (if applicable)
 - a. Follow external review guidelines: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
3. Dossier submission
4. Dossier review, vote, and written recommendation by eligible unit faculty
5. Dossier review and written recommendation by unit head
6. First rebuttal window: 3 business days following conclusion of unit-level process
7. Dossier review, vote, and written recommendation by Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)
 - a. PTRC is a committee of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, three from each disciplinary division of the College
 - b. Details on membership and deliberation are found here: www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-two/section-2-3.html
8. Dossier review and written recommendation by Dean
9. Second rebuttal window: 3 business days following conclusion of college-level process
10. Dossier review and written advice to Provost by University-Level Review Committee (ULRC)
 - a. Only for cases in which there has been at least one negative recommendation at previous levels
 - b. ULRC is a committee of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, two from each college
 - c. ULRC guidelines are linked here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
11. Dossier review and written recommendation by Provost
12. Recommendation by President to Board of Trustees
13. Decision by Board of Trustees

Process timetable and deadlines

See the “Evergreen” calendar linked here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html

Appendix B: Review Candidate Preparatory Exercises

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

As a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, you are faced with a challenging task of assembling a focused dossier that captures your body of work and presents a persuasive case. This challenge is also an opportunity: to represent and reinforce for yourself and for your reviewers why you do what you do, your key contributions to the institution and the profession, and how the trajectory of your work during the review period aligns with the standards for your review.

Based on one-on-one consultations with a number of individual candidates over the last couple years, we recommend the following preparatory exercise before you assemble your dossier materials.

1. Familiarize yourself with Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Familiarize yourself with your unit’s policy on reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
3. Sit down with a copy of your CV and a copy of your unit policy and highlight the applicable language to your case. Be attentive to both quantitative and qualitative standards and framing language.
4. Go through your CV and highlight key accomplishments that align with both the qualitative and the quantitative standards.
5. Formulate bullet-style notes that could serve as key points an argument for how your body of work meets the standards in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. Again, be attentive to both qualitative and quantitative standards.

This exercise is not compulsory and your bullets and notes need not be submitted to anyone. We recommend it because it can help you start working in concrete ways to make the policy-grounded case that your accomplishments meet the standards for a given review. You may also find that it establishes a productive basis for guidance conversations with your unit head, a mentor, and/or an associate dean.

Too often candidates experience a review process as something over which they have no control. This is not accurate. As a candidate you are empowered to make your case, and this prep exercise can help you do that.

Qualified Rank Faculty

As a candidate for reappointment or promotion, you are faced with the challenge of assembling a dossier that captures your body of work and presents a persuasive case to reviewers. This

challenge is also an opportunity for you to represent and reinforce—both for yourself and for your reviewers— why it is you do what you do, your key contributions to your institution and profession, and how the trajectory of your work during the review period aligns with the standards for your review.

Based on our conversations with a number of candidates who have gone through this process in the past few years, we recommend you spend time completing the following exercise before you assemble your dossier materials.

1. Familiarize yourself with Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Familiarize yourself with your unit's policy on reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
3. Sit down with a copy of your CV and a copy of your unit policy and highlight the applicable language to your case. Be attentive to both quantitative and qualitative standards and framing language.
4. Go through your CV and highlight key accomplishments that align with both the qualitative and the qualitative standards.
5. Formulate bullet-style notes that provide key evidence for the argument that your body of work over the review period meets your unit's standards in the areas of teaching and service. Again, be attentive to both qualitative and quantitative standards. (Note: For those QRF colleagues with an active research/creative agenda, this is your opportunity to frame how this work connects to your performance in teaching, teaching-related, and/or service activities).

This exercise is not compulsory and your bullets and notes need not submitted to anyone. This exercise will help you make a broader policy-grounded case for reappointment/promotion which frames your teaching and service narratives and your record of accomplishments within your unit's standards for review. You may also find that this activity builds a productive basis for an ongoing dialogue with your unit head, a mentor, and/or associate dean about your role in the professional life of your unit and university.

Too often, we have found, candidates feel like they have little control over the review process. This is not so. As a candidate you are empowered to make the most compelling argument possible to support your case. Taking the time to complete this exercise will empower you to do just that.