REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCESSES

ACADEMIC UNIT: <u>DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES (DET)</u>

TABLE OF CONTENTS   **PAGE**

SECTION I: REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION POLICY FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

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

The Annual Performance Review and Enhanced Performance Review assess teaching effectiveness and service activities that are expected of all NTTF in the Department of Engineering Technologies (DET). Considerable attention is paid to setting performance indicators for faculty while allowing individuality seen in the various undergraduate and graduate programs comprising the department due to program diversity within the DET. Evidence of NTTF Teaching and Service Effectiveness will take into account all submitted materials. No further material submissions will be considered after the due date.

Annual performance review (APR): Success in APR will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member in Teaching Effectiveness and Service.

Performances in teaching and service activities will be categorized in the following levels:
- Exceeds Expectations: Meeting all the following Required evidence and a minimum of 50 % of Desired evidence
- Meets Expectations: Meeting all the following Required evidence
- Fails to Meet Expectations: Not meeting all but only 50% to 99% of the following Required evidence
- Unacceptable: Meeting less than 50% of the following Required evidence

Teaching evidence must include all Required evidence items and may also include Desired evidence items listed below:

	Required	Desired
Maintain timely course-related communication with students by providing feedback.	X	
Receive mostly positive quantitative (typically 3.25 out of 5.0) and qualitative results of students' teaching evaluations.	X	
Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations (minimum of one per academic year)	X	
Evidence of Instructional development such as improvement of curriculum, teaching methods and effectiveness, course outlines, syllabi, effective use of instructional technology, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses	X	

	Required	Desired
taught. Additional instructional development might include the development of new courses, assignments, and/or labs.		
Participation at teaching related activities such as conferences and workshops, courses taken, participation in campus wide learning community, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills.		X
Develop new teaching methods, apply innovations in teaching, and develop new labs, modules, courses, and/or programs.		X
Receive honorable mentions, teaching awards and distinctions.		X
Engage students in extra-curriculum activities including facility tours, industry projects, competitions, or attending conferences/trade shows, etc.		X
Other measures of teaching effectiveness such as graduate teaching, co-operative education supervision, etc.		X

Service evidence

The service category reflects activities that provide for the governance of the program, department, college, and university. Service activities include contributions to the profession and the community, within the faculty member's professional discipline. NTTF service activities are evaluated on a range of contributions within two categories: institutional efforts and professional service efforts.

Service activities must include all of the following Required service evidence items and may also include Desired service evidence items:

a. **Institutional Service Efforts**:

	Required	Desired
Records of relevant membership and appointment on a minimum of two committees per academic year (any combination of departmental, college, or university committees).	X	
Institutional work as indicated by departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, and review teams.	X	
Assisting with department-wide recruitment, retention, outreach, and development efforts.	X	

	Required	Desired
Providing mentorship to assigned students as outlined by college policy.	X	
Chairing any committees such as Senate, UPC, Faculty Search, etc.		X
Support and coordination responsibilities for the department		X
Special administrative assignment, undergraduate and graduate program coordinator or director, and performing administrative tasks.		X
Mentorship to assigned fellow faculty (peer mentoring).		X
Receive honorable mentions, institutional service awards, and distinctions.		X

b. **Professional Service Efforts**:

	Required	Desired
Attendance at professional service events/meetings at international, national, regional, and local settings.		X
Leadership positions held in professional associations (e.g., elected/selected national level positions, conference chair, editor, etc.).		X
Contributing to organizations within the faculty's professional discipline that help the outside community (e.g., paid/unpaid consultancy, expert opinion, serving on advisory board, service-learning programs, etc.).		X
Records of service to public, private or extramural funding agencies such as proposal reviewers, book reviewers, paper reviewers, panel members, session track chair, moderator, etc.		X
Receive honorable mentions, professional service awards, and distinctions.		X
Other relevant professional service efforts		X

Note - Non Tenure Track Faculty contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define her/his total contributions in teaching and service.

Enhanced performance review (EPR):
The Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in EPR will be same as the APR narrated above, except that the review period is longer. It will focus on the progress made by the NTTF during those years. EPR assesses the cumulative accomplishments and focuses on the progress made by the NTTF during those years. A successful EPR case will have the following:

1) Receive mostly positive qualitative student comments on teaching evaluations during the review period.
2) Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations during the review period.
3) Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.25 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses during the review period.
4) At least one example of instructional development during the review period.
5) Demonstrated record of service to the department, college, and/or university during the review period (generally, two committees per year or the equivalent)

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

a. **Material Creation** - NTT faculty members will submit a dossier. All documents must be related to activities performed during the review period (last one year for APR and last three years or since appointment for EPR). The submission of all documents must be done through the university's electronic system.

The NTTF will submit a dossier consisting of, but not limited to, the following documents:
i. Department of Engineering Technologies Promotion Document (RTP)
ii. BGSU formatted curriculum vitae/ current professional vitae for faculty (PVF)
iii. Teaching Narrative
iv. Course syllabi
v. Documentation of Peer Evaluations of Teaching
vi. Documentation of all Student Evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative scores
vii. Other supporting documents or indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
viii. Semester by semester course load with student enrollment
ix. Service Narrative
x. Relevant Supporting Service Materials
xi. Research Narrative (optional)
xii. Examples of Scholarly/Creative Work (optional)
xiii. Previous APR evaluations (for EPR)
xiv. Other, documented activity

b. **Material Submission Process – Annual Performance Reviews (APRs)** - The Departmental process for APR consists of the following steps:
   i. The faculty member documents accomplishments for review period by means of Annual Dossier materials.
   ii. The faculty member submits a Dossier for review by the departmental NTTF APR Committee.

c. **Material Submission Process - Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs)** - The Departmental process for EPR consists of the following steps:
   i. The faculty member documents accomplishments for the EPR review period by means of a Dossier with at least the previous three-year period accomplishments.
   ii. The faculty member submits a Dossier via the university's electronic system for review by the departmental EPR Committee in accordance with the departmental RTP.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

The Department of Engineering Technologies APR/EPR committee, selected by the department faculty, is responsible for reviewing every bargaining unit faculty member. The APR/EPR Committee shall consist of all Bargaining Unit Faculty Members excepting first year faculty. Faculty review will be conducted by BUFM with voting eligibility. The tenured, probationary tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty members who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed are eligible to serve on the committee in the review process.

NTTF APR Process:

   i. The departmental APR Committee will review the Dossier. The Chair of the NTTF APR Committee will compile the Committee's vote and comments in a written recommendation. The NTTF APR Committee Chair communicates the written recommendation to the Department Chair, who will share that recommendation with the faculty member.
   ii. The Department Chair prepares a written recommendation to the Dean that includes a report of the APR Committee's vote and comments, meets with the NTTF member, provides the member with a copy of the written recommendation, and discusses the content of the recommendation.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

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, (2) academic unit policies, and (3) the academic achievements of the NTTF member.

Unit Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer
Successful NTTF candidates for promotion to Lecturer will typically have earned both generally high student evaluations and consistently good peer evaluations in teaching, and have fulfilled their various responsibilities to the department, its programs, and its students. A successful case for promotion to lecturer will include

the following during the review period:

    i.   Candidate will hold a masters or higher degree in a related discipline.

    ii.   Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations.

    iii.   Three to four examples of instructional development.

    iv.   Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.25 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses since last appointment/promotion.

    v.   Receive mostly positive qualitative student evaluations since last appointment/promotion.

    vi.   Demonstrated record of service to the department, college, and/or university during the review period (generally, two committees per year or the equivalent)

    vii.   Demonstrated record of continual contributions to departmental functions such as recruitment efforts, retention efforts, accreditation, committee efforts, etc.

    viii.   Demonstrated record of professional development activities

Unit Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Successful NTTF candidates for promotion to Senior Lectured will typically have earned both excellent student evaluations and consistently high peer evaluations in teaching, and who have fulfilled their various responsibilities to the University, college, department, its programs, and its students. A successful case for promotion to senior lecturer will have the following during the review period:

    i.   Candidate will hold a master or higher degree in a related discipline.

    ii.   Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations.

    iii.   Three to four examples of instructional development.

    iv.   Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.50 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses since last appointment/promotion.

    v.   Receive mostly positive qualitative student evaluations since last appointment/promotion.

    vi.   Demonstrated record of continual contributions to departmental functions such as recruitment efforts, retention efforts, accreditation, committee efforts, etc., as well as some college and/or university service.

    vii.   Some of the candidate's service and/or teaching-related activities should involve leadership roles.

    viii.   Demonstrated record of professional development and/or professional service activities.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The NTTF will submit the dossier via the university's electronic system. The Department and NTTF should follow the process referenced in the CBA.

Promotion Steps for Instructor to Lecturer or Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: The NTTF will submit a Dossier consisting of, but not limited to, the following documents:

      i.   Department of Engineering Technologies Promotion Document (RTP)
     ii.   BGSU formatted curriculum vitae/ current professional vitae for faculty (PVF)
    iii.   Teaching Narrative
    iv.   Semester by semester course load with student enrollment
     v.   Course syllabi
    vi.   Documentation of Peer Evaluations of Teaching
    vii.   Documentation of all Student Evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative scores
   viii.   Other supporting documents or indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
    ix.   Service Narrative
     x.   Relevant Supporting Service Materials
    xi.   Previous APR and EPR evaluations
    xii.   Other, documented activity

SECTION II: REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

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

The Annual Performance Review and Enhanced Performance Review assess teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and service activities that are expected of all Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) in the Department of Engineering Technologies (DET). Considerable attention is paid to setting performance indicators for faculty while allowing individuality seen in the various undergraduate and graduate programs comprising the department due to program diversity within the DET. Evidence of TTF Teaching, Research, and Service Effectiveness will take into account all submitted materials. No further material submissions will be considered after the due date.

Annual performance review (APR):
Success in APR will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member in teaching effectiveness, research and creative work, and service.

Performances in teaching, research/creative activity, and service activities will be categorized in the following levels:

- Exceeds Expectations: Meeting all the following Required evidence and a minimum of 50 % of Desired evidence
- Meets Expectations: Meeting all the following Required evidence
- Fails to Meet Expectations: Not meeting all but only 50% to 99% of the following Required evidence
- Unacceptable: Meeting less than 50% of the Required evidence

Teaching evidence must include all Required evidence items and may also include Desired evidence items listed below:

	Required	Desired
Maintain timely course-related communication with students by providing feedback.	X	
Mostly positive quantitative (3.25 out of 5.0) and qualitative results of students' teaching evaluations.	X	
Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations (minimum of one per academic year)	X	
Evidence of Instructional development such as improvement of curriculum, teaching methods and effectiveness, course outlines, syllabi, effective use of instructional technology, and other items	X	

that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught. Additional instruction development might include the development of new courses, assignments, and/or labs.		
Evidence of teaching effectiveness via supporting letters		X
Participation at teaching related activities such as conferences and workshops, courses taken, participation in campus wide learning community, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills.		X
Develop new teaching methods, apply innovations in teaching, and develop new labs, modules, courses, and/or programs.		X
Receive honorable mentions, teaching awards and distinctions.		X
Engage students in extra-curriculum activities including facility tours, industry projects, competitions, or attending conferences/trade shows, etc.		X
Engage undergraduate and graduate (as applicable) students in research and scholarly activities.		X
Serving on project/dissertation committees for graduate students.		X
Chairing project/dissertation committees for graduate students.		X
Receive external financial or equipment/software support related to teaching.		X
Other measures of teaching effectiveness such as co-operative education supervision, etc.		X

Research and Creative Work must include all Required items and may also include Desired evidence items. Tenure track faculty members are expected to show increased levels of research and creative work activity from year 1 to year 5. Publication quality is an important factor and the department favors creative work in leading publications. Refereed publications are given greater consideration than non-refereed publications.

Initially, candidates are launching their research careers and thus during the first and second year APRs, manuscripts under review or revision are demonstrative of research activity which signals likely research productivity (e.g., publications in peer-reviewed journals). Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review (typically during the third year), successful candidates for the fourth and fifth year annual performance reviews will show sustained (or increased) research activity as well as research productivity, including the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles. Hence, even though a published article is not a strict requirement in any given year of the annual performance review according to the table below, candidates must show adequate progress towards tenure, which will necessitate publications in some of these years.

	Required	Desired
Actively engaged with the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles (at least one submitted per academic year), which has scholarly significance within the discipline.	X	
Actively engaged with the dissemination of research/creative works through peer-reviewed conference proceedings/professional presentations or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in juried settings (at least one publication/presentation submitted per academic year).	X	
Actively pursuing competitive research/scholarly grants for basic/applied research and development projects (at least one external proposal submission).	X	
Attendance at professional development workshops/training/ webinars relating to scholarly and creative work (at least one attendance).	X	
Actively working to establish research collaboration with other faculty members, industry professionals, external organizations and agencies (at least one meeting).		X
External funding for research, development, or innovative creative projects.		X
Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles.		X*
Publication of peer-reviewed conference proceedings.		X
Publication of books, book chapters, monographs.		X
Patent for, or creative rights to, a product/software.		X
Recognition for outstanding research - awards and distinctions.		X

* Although publication in any given year is not a strict requirement, successful candidates must have at least one peer-reviewed journal publication (or the equivalent) for the EPR and four peer-reviewed journal publications for tenure and promotion.

Service evidence The service category reflects activities that provide for the governance of the program, department, college, and university. Service activities also include contributions to the profession and the community, within the faculty member's professional discipline. TTF service activities are evaluated on a range of contributions within two categories: institutional efforts and professional service efforts.

Service activities must include all of the following Required service evidence items and may also include Desired service evidence items:

a. Institutional Service Efforts:

	Required	Desired
Records of relevant membership and appointment on a minimum of two committees per academic year.	X	
Institutional work as indicated by departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, and review teams.	X	
Assisting with department-wide recruitment, retention, outreach, and development efforts	X	
Providing mentorship to assigned students as outlined by college policy.	X	
Chairing any committees such as Senate, UPC, Faculty Search, etc.		X
Support and coordination responsibilities for the department.		X
Special administrative assignment, undergraduate and graduate program coordinator or director, and performing administrative tasks.		X
Receive honorable mentions, institutional service awards, and distinctions.		X
Mentorship to assigned fellow faculty (peer mentoring).		X

b. Professional Service Efforts:

	Required	Desired
Record of service to professional associations within the faculty's discipline	X	
Attendance at professional service events/meetings at international, national, regional, and local settings		X
Leadership positions held in professional associations (e.g., elected/selected national level positions, conference chair, editor, etc.).		X

Contributing to organizations within the faculty's professional discipline that help the outside community (e.g., paid/unpaid consultancy, expert opinion, serving on advisory board, service learning programs, etc.).		X
Records of service to public, private or extramural funding agencies such as proposal reviewers, book reviewers, paper reviewers, panel members, session track chair, moderator, etc.		X
Receive honorable mentions, institutional service awards, and distinctions.		X
Other relevant professional service efforts		X

Enhanced performance review (EPR): The Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in EPR will be same as the APR narrated above, except that the review period is longer, as delineated in the CBA. It will focus on the progress made by the TTF during those years. EPR assesses the cumulative accomplishments and focuses on the progress made by the TTF during those years. A successful EPR case will have the following:

1) Receive mostly positive qualitative student comments on teaching evaluations during the review period.
2) Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations during the review period.
3) Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.25 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses during the review period.
4) At least one example of instructional development during the review period.
5) Evidence of ongoing research activity and at least one peer-reviewed journal publication or the equivalent.
6) At least one submission of a competitive grant proposal to an external funding agency.
7) Demonstrated record of service to the department, college, and/or university during the review period (generally, two committees per year or the equivalent).

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

a. **Material Creation** - TTF members will submit a dossier. All documents must be related to activities performed during the review period (last one year for APR and last three years or since appointment for EPR). The submission of all documents must be done through the university's electronic system.

The TTF will submit a dossier consisting of, but not limited to, the following documents:
   i. Department of Engineering Technologies Promotion Document (RTP)
   ii. BGSU formatted curriculum vitae/ current professional vitae for faculty (PVF)
   iii. Teaching Narrative
   iv. Semester by semester course load with student enrollment
   v. Course syllabi

vi.   Documentation of Peer Evaluations of Teaching
vii. Documentation of all Student Evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative scores
viii. Other supporting documents or indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
ix.   Service Narrative
x.   List of services (committees, duration, roles, and major contributions)
xi.   Relevant Supporting Service Materials
xii. Research Narrative
xiii. Copies of research/scholarly works (e.g., publications, proposals, etc.)
xiv. Other supporting documents of research/creative work effectiveness
xv.   Previous APR evaluations (for EPR)
xvi. Other, documented activity

It is TTF candidate's responsibility to provide necessary information/evidence of activities so that the review committee can evaluate those appropriately. While optional, it is suggested that a peer reviewed publication entry in the dossier should contain all or some of the following information:

i.   Impact factors of the journal in which it was published
ii.   Typical acceptance rate for that journal
iii. Number of citations of the publication
iv.   Ranking of the journal within the discipline

Material Submission Process – Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) - The Departmental process for APR consists of the following steps:

i.   The faculty member documents accomplishments for review period by means of Annual Dossier materials.
ii.   The faculty member submits a dossier for review by the departmental TTF APR Committee.

b. **Material Submission Process - Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs)** - The Departmental process for EPR consists of the following steps:
   i.   The faculty member documents accomplishments for the EPR review period by means of a Dossier with at least the previous three-year period accomplishments.
   ii. The faculty member submits a Dossier for review by the departmental EPR Committee in accordance with the departmental RTP.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

The Department of Engineering Technologies APR committee is responsible for reviewing every bargaining unit faculty member. The APR Committee shall consist of all Bargaining Unit Faculty Members excepting first year faculty. Faculty review will be conducted by BUFM with voting eligibility. The tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed are eligible to serve on the APR committee in the review process.

TTF APR Process:
    i.   The departmental APR Committee will review the Dossier. The Chair of the TTF APR Committee will compile the Committee's vote and comments in a written recommendation. The TTF APR Committee Chair communicates the written recommendation to the Department Chair, who will share that recommendation with the faculty member.
    ii.   The Department Chair prepares a written recommendation to the Dean that includes a report of the APR Committee's vote and comments, meets with the TTF member, provides the member with a copy of the written recommendation, and discusses the content of the recommendation.

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

Following is the criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor and from associate professor to professor.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:
Promotion to, or appointment at, the rank of associate professor, and/or the granting of tenure, require evidence of continuing effectiveness in each of the three dimensions of performance (teaching, research, and service). Successful TTF candidates will have demonstrated excellence in research productivity, have generally high student evaluations and consistently good peer evaluations in teaching, and regularly, promptly, and cooperatively served his/her profession, the University, college, department, its programs, and its students. A successful case for tenue and/or promotion to associate professor will have the following during the review period:

    i.   Candidate will hold a doctorate or other approved doctoral degree in a related discipline.
    ii.   Receive mostly positive qualitative student comments on teaching evaluations since last appointment/promotion.
    iii.   Receive mostly positive and/or constructive peer teaching observations.
    iv.   Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.50 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses since last appointment/promotion.
    v.   Three or four examples of instructional development.
    vi.   Produce a recognized professional record of scholarship (minimum of four articles/books published in refereed journals/publishers and minimum of three refereed conference proceedings within the discipline) since last appointment/promotion. Journal publications can replace conference proceeding requirements, but not vice versa.
    vii.   Receive at least one competitive research grant from external funding agency since last appointment/promotion.
    viii.   Demonstrated record of continual contributions to departmental functions such as recruitment efforts, retention efforts, accreditation, committee efforts, curriculum development, etc.

ix. Evidence of service to the college and/or university as well as some professional service to the discipline

x. Demonstrated record of professional development and/or professional service activities

External reviews must be solicited according to the procedures provided by the Provost's Office.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to, or appointment at, the rank of Professor requires evidence of continued effectiveness in the three categories of performance (teaching, research, and service) and demonstration of excellence in at least two of the categories. Successful candidates will have established himself/herself as a distinguished educator and a reputed researcher in the discipline, who have regularly, promptly, and cooperatively fulfilled their service responsibilities to the profession, University, college, department, its programs, and its students. Candidates standing for promotion to professor must provide evidence of sustained outstanding research productivity, excellent peer evaluations of teaching, a pattern of consistently strong student evaluations, and exemplary institutional and professional service. A successful case for promotion to professor will have the following:

i. Candidate will hold a doctorate or other approved doctoral degree in a related discipline.

ii. Receive student quantitative evaluations of 3.8 or higher on a 5.0 point scale based on combined average of all courses since last appointment/promotion or in the last five years as an associate professor.

iii. Receive mostly positive student qualitative evaluations in all courses since last appointment/promotion.

iv. Demonstrated record of continual contributions to departmental functions such as recruitment efforts, retention efforts, accreditation, curriculum development, committee efforts, etc.

v. Demonstrated record of professional development activities to improve teaching and research credentials (e.g. training, certification, continuous education, etc.)

vi. Produce a recognized professional record of scholarship (minimum of five articles/books published in refereed journals/publishers and four refereed conference proceedings within the discipline) since last appointment/promotion or in the last five years as Associate Professor. Journal publications can replace conference proceeding requirements, but not vice versa.

vii. Establish an extramural research program that involves participation of graduate and undergraduate students.

viii. Demonstrated record of continual and dependable institutional services playing as leading role.

ix. Demonstrated record of leadership with professional organizations within the discipline.

x. Produce a nationally recognized professional record of scholarship service.

xi.   Receive at least two competitive research grants or the equivalent from external funding agencies since last appointment/promotion or in the last five years as Associate Professor.

External reviews must be solicited according to the procedures provided by the Provost's Office.

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

Material Creation - TTF members will submit a dossier. All documents must be related to activities performed during the review period (last one year for APR and last three years or since appointment for EPR). The submission of all documents must be done through the university's electronic system.

The TTF will submit a dossier consisting of, but not limited to, the following documents:
i.   Department of Engineering Technologies Promotion Document (RTP)
ii.   BGSU formatted curriculum vitae/ current professional vitae for faculty (PVF)
iii.   Semester by semester course load with student enrollment
iv.   Teaching Narrative
v.   Course syllabi
vi.   Documentation of Peer Evaluations of Teaching
vii.   Documentation of all Student Evaluations – both quantitative and qualitative scores
viii.   Other supporting documents or indicators of Teaching Effectiveness
ix.   Service Narrative
x.   List of services (committees, duration, roles, and major contributions)
xi.   Relevant Supporting Service Materials
xii.   Research Narrative
xiii.   Copies of research/scholarly works (e.g., publications, proposals, etc.)
xiv.   Other supporting documents of research/creative work effectiveness
xv.   Previous APR and EPR (if applicable) evaluations
xvi.   Other, documented activity

It is the Tenure Track Faculty candidate's responsibility to provide necessary information/evidence of activities so that the review committee can evaluate those appropriately. While optional, it is suggested that a peer reviewed publication entry in the dossier should contain all or some of the following information:

i.   Impact factors of the journal in which it was published
ii.   Typical acceptance rate for that journal
iii.   Number of citations of the publication
iv.   Ranking of the journal within the discipline

The Department and the candidate will follow the process referenced in the CBA for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy.

Approved by the School/Department of _____ **ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES** _____

Chair/Director _____ Date _5/15/2019_

Reviewed by the Dean _Jennie J. Hallmore_____ Date _5/15/2019_

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

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost _____ Date _5/30/19_

_✓_ concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):