

## Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Sociology

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

**Annual performance** will be assessed by the Chair, who will consider the quality of instruction delivered by NTTF and the NTTF's participation in service activities. Instruction quality will be assessed using several indicators, including but not necessarily limited to quantitative and qualitative student teaching evaluations and peer evaluations. Performance is deemed satisfactory in the event that NTTF receive a positive peer evaluation, earn quantitative evaluation scores that are comparable to or exceed the department average, and qualitative responses do not raise significant red flags that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations that indicate the NTTF is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching the appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. Quantitative scores of 3.0 or higher (on a 4 point scale) are expected. For instructors whose quantitative evaluations are substantially below (i.e., 0.5 points or more on the 4 point scale) the department average for comparable courses, the Chair may turn to additional evidence such as course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, and so forth) and peer evaluations of teaching to determine whether the instructor is performing adequately. In the event the instructor is deemed to not be performing adequately in his/her position, the Chair may provide guidance on how the NTTF can improve his/her performance or recommend to the Dean that the NTTF not be renewed.

**Enhanced Performance Review** criteria largely parallel those guiding APRs, but span the past three years of performance and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. NTTF will not only be evaluated on their student evaluations and peer classroom evaluations but also on the quality of their teaching and service philosophy statements and course materials. First, strong candidates will have quantitative teaching evaluation scores that tend to mirror or exceed the department average. Second, they will have qualitative evaluations that are largely devoid of feedback indicating the instructor does not meet minimum standards in the classroom. Third, strong candidates will have received peer evaluations of their teaching each year that indicate they engage and communicate effectively with students. Finally, strong candidates will have implemented course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, etc) that are rigorous yet also at the appropriate level and aligned with the department's curriculum. NTTF will also be evaluated on their service activities, which should include participation in a department committee every year as well as some service to the college or university. Regional or national level service is desirable but not required. The EPR will encompass overall performance during the past three years.

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

For APRs, NTTF should provide the Chair with their curriculum vitae (CV) at least one month prior to the College deadline for APR memos to be submitted by Chairs. The department will collate the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations and the peer evaluations.

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single spaced pages) that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
- Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught in the past three years
- Peer teaching evaluations (minimum of three from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate and obtained in each of the past three academic years)
- Course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and so forth, for three courses. For online courses, provide additional materials such as discussion board content, audio lectures, or other elements that demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Materials that demonstrate teaching innovation are encouraged but not required.
- Service philosophy narrative summarizing the candidate's service activities over the past three years and goals for the future

The Chair shall provide candidates with a summary table of their quantitative evaluation scores and department averages at the comparable level. The department will collate the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations and the peer evaluations. Candidates must collate their other supporting materials (including but not limited to their teaching and service philosophy statements, course materials, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness and service activity). Candidates must upload their documents into the eRPT system for electronic review by the Voting Faculty and Chair.

### Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, 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.

## Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

### 1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Promotion to Lecturer in the Department of Sociology requires at least a Master's degree from an accredited college or university, and preferably additional work toward the doctorate; at least six years of full-time service at the rank of instructor at BGSU; and evidence of effective teaching and service to the department and university. Eligible candidates may submit their materials for promotion to the Chair at their discretion after at least six years in rank of Instructor and two successful EPRs.

Successful candidates for promotion to Lecturer will have earned consistently positive evaluations from students on both quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, primarily positive peer evaluations of teaching, demonstrated success in at least two secondary performance indicators used in the evaluation of instructional development (a detailed list is shown in section E below) in the most recent six years as Instructor. In terms of service effectiveness, the candidate should provide clear evidence that s/he has regularly, promptly, and cooperatively fulfilled his or her expectations to service effectiveness during the six most recent years, including annual department committees as well as a minimum of at least two College and/or University committees.

### 2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have earned consistently high evaluations from students on both quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, primarily positive peer evaluations of teaching, demonstrated success in at least four secondary performance indicators used in the evaluation of instructional development (A detailed list is shown in section E below) in the most recent six years as Lecturer. In terms of service effectiveness the candidate will provide clear evidence that s/he has regularly, promptly, and cooperatively fulfilled his or her expectations to service effectiveness during the six most recent years, including annual service on department committees as well as service on a minimum of four committees including at least two at the college or university level, evidence of regional or national service to discipline (eg, the American Sociological Association).

## Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The promotion dossier shall contain:

- Teaching philosophy narrative (no more than three single spaced pages) that describes the candidate's approach to teaching
- Quantitative and qualitative course evaluations for all courses taught in the past six years

- Peer teaching evaluations (minimum of six from at least three different faculty of higher rank than the candidate and obtained in each of the past six academic years)
- Course materials, including syllabi and assignments, for three courses. For online courses, provide additional materials such as discussion board content, audio lectures, or other elements that demonstrate teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of innovative instructional activities or curricular development
- Service philosophy narrative summarizing the candidate's service activities over the past six years and goals for the future

Secondary performance indicators (minimum of two for promotion to Lecturer and four for promotion to Senior Lecturer), included at the discretion of the candidate, may include the following:

- Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved;
- Evidence of effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, Honors' theses advised, etc.);
- Teaching awards;
- Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;
- Documentation of work with student organizations;
- Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities designed to improve teaching;
- Service work (eg, committee membership) for regional or national disciplinary organizations (eg, the American Sociological Association, the North Central Sociological Association)
- Presentations at regional or national disciplinary conferences about teaching or pedagogy, and/or
- Other evidence that, in the judgment of the candidate, documents the quality of his/her teaching.

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

**Annual performance reviews (APR)** are scheduled at various points during the academic year depending on the number of years on the tenure track. All candidates must submit their materials. Successful candidates will demonstrate effective teaching; research activity that culminates in publications in peer reviewed journals; and service at the department and ideally the university and national levels. As they progress on the tenure track, successful candidates will demonstrate an accumulation of teaching, research, and service activities that reflect a growth in productivity (both quality and quantity) over the six year period. Initially,

candidates are launching their research careers and thus during the first and second year APRs, manuscripts under review or revision are demonstrative of research activity which signals likely research productivity (e.g., publications in peer-reviewed journals). Following a successful Enhanced Performance Review during the third year, successful candidates for the fourth and fifth year annual reviews will show sustained (or increased) research activity as well as research productivity, including the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles. Similarly, successful candidates will evidence strong teaching effectiveness from the outset or demonstrate sustained improvement over time, ultimately meeting or exceeding department averages in their teaching evaluations, receiving positive peer evaluations, and preparing and implementing rigorous course materials, and making meaningful contributions to the department's teaching mission. Candidates will also evidence some involvement in graduate student theses and dissertations through committee membership. Finally, the scope and level of service engaged in by successful candidates will increase over the six year period, expanding from solely department level service to university and possibly even national service. During years 1 and 2 on the tenure track, candidates may only have department level service, but they should be seeking opportunities to serve at the college, university, and regional or national levels. By years 3, 4, and 5, successful candidates will have assumed service responsibilities at the college or university level, in addition to their department level service.

**The Enhanced Performance Review (EPR)** occurs during the fall semester of the candidate's third year on the tenure track. At this point, the candidate must demonstrate success in teaching, research, and service. Specifically, to demonstrate success in teaching, criteria include quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), qualitative student responses that indicate effective instruction, and primarily positive peer evaluations. Research success shall be indicated by research *productivity*, namely articles published or in press since the initial hire, with an emphasis on first or solo authorship to demonstrate research leadership and independence. Journal quality is an important factor and the department favors publications in top specialty (and general) journals. Books and book chapters are also desirable. Refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Manuscripts under review will be considered, and those that have received an invitation to revise and resubmit will be viewed more favorably than those merely under review. Grant activity (submission or receipt) is desirable but not necessary for a successful EPR as it is secondary to publication activity. Other indicators of research activity of relevance include presentations at national meetings and invited talks. The successful candidate normally will have one or more published or in-press journal articles (or equivalent) since initial hire, one or more manuscripts under review, and others in preparation for submission to a journal. Service on department committees each year is required. Ideally, the candidate shall have pursued service at the university (or college) level and be beginning to participate in some service to the discipline at the national level (e.g., organize a session at a national meeting, serve as a manuscript reviewer for journals, etc.). A willingness to seek out service opportunities at the national level is desirable, but participation at this level is not required.

For APRs, the faculty member should provide the Chair with a complete CV that will be distributed to the voting faculty.

For EPRs, materials will be made available by the candidate for voting faculty (tenured associate and full professors) and the Chair to review at least six weeks prior to the College deadline for submission. The Chair shall provide candidates with a summary table of their quantitative evaluation scores and department averages at the comparable level. The department will collate the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations and the peer evaluations. Candidates must provide their own CV as well as all other evidence of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to their teaching philosophy statement (no more than three pages in length), course materials, and summary of experience supervising undergraduate and graduate students (eg, MA thesis committee advising or membership). EPR dossiers also shall include a research statement (no more than three pages in length), articles, book chapters, and books published or in press, and other evidence of research productivity. Finally, candidates shall include a statement of service philosophy (no more than three pages in length) and evidence of service activities. Candidates will upload their documents into the eRPT system for electronic review by the voting faculty and Chair.

#### Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair in consultation with the voting faculty as described in point #2 below, in accordance with this reappointment policy. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, and service. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The voting faculty (i.e., tenured associate and full professors) shall convene a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress in teaching, research, and service over the past 12 months. The voting faculty will conduct an anonymous yes or no vote on whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure. The Chair will observe at the meeting but not participate in the discussion or the vote. If the Chair disagrees with the voting faculty's recommendation, he/she shall state the reasons for disagreement in writing. The Chair also will include a report of the tenured faculty vote and their overall assessment of the candidate's progress in his/her letter to the Dean and to the Provost/VPAA.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure** is based on convincing evidence that the candidate has developed an independent research identity and is regularly publishing high quality research. The candidate must also provide documentation of effective teaching and active service during their probationary period at BGSU. Finally, they must show promise of sustained productivity in all three areas, especially the dedication to establish a national reputation for scholarship and leadership.

Specifically, effective teaching is evidenced by quantitative teaching evaluations that are comparable with or exceed the department average (at the same course level), qualitative student responses that indicate effective instruction, and primarily positive peer evaluations. Successful teaching also normally involves committee membership on one or more graduate student theses and dissertations. Though not required, other indicators of teaching effectiveness may include: new courses developed, documentation of substantial improvements to existing courses, evidence of effective integration of new technology or pedagogical approaches, teaching awards, mentorship of undergraduate research (e.g., honor's theses), publication of scholarship on teaching, and evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside the standard curriculum.

Research *productivity* is essential for candidates to be promoted to Associate Professor. Candidates must be productive researchers as evidenced by refereed articles published or in press since the initial hire. Books published by a recognized scholarly press are also desirable and may carry more weight than articles depending on the quality, length, and originality (i.e., the extent to which the content does not overlap with other published works). Journal quality is a leading indicator of the caliber of the scholarship produced by the candidate and consequently the department favors publications in top specialty (and general) journals. Generally, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Book chapters are also desirable, but do not carry the same weight as peer-reviewed journal articles. External grant receipt indicates a high level of productivity and is viewed quite favorably, but is not required for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to research productivity, research independence is also an important marker of scholarly achievement that indicates a candidate has established a research identity. Thus, first or solo authorship on publications (or PI status on grants) is particularly advantageous because it demonstrates research leadership and independence.

Research *activity* signals eventual productivity and demonstrates an ongoing stream of scholarship. Thus, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should have a pipeline of manuscripts. Manuscripts under review will be considered, and those that have received an invitation to revise and resubmit will be viewed much more favorably than those under review. External grant submission is another desirable indicator of research activity and is viewed positively, but is not necessary for promotion to Associate Professor. Faculty are expected to seek opportunities from appropriate sources given their research specialties. Other relevant indicators of research activity include presentations at national meetings and invited talks which attest to the reputation of the candidate. Further, participation in national meetings (as a paper presenter or discussant) is an important way of establishing visibility and a reputation in the field. External reviewers will evaluate the candidate's research record and their conclusions will be considered in the department's assessment of the candidate's research performance.

The assessment of a candidate's research record for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor involves consideration of both research productivity and activity. Typically, successful candidates will have averaged at least one refereed publication per year (or equivalent), but the number of publications will be appraised within the context of the quality of the publication outlets and the order of authorship. The candidate's research record will form a coherent whole, establishing the candidate as a recognized scholar in a specific topical area. The expected impact

of the candidate's body of work on the field is also a relevant consideration. In addition to other publications, the exceptional candidate will have published several articles as first or sole author in leading specialty (or top general) journals and, if appropriate, demonstrate some level of external grant activity (e.g., grant application submission).

Service is also important for promotion to associate. Consistent active service on department committees each year is required. Also, the candidate shall have served on (or attempted to serve on) at least one college or university level committee. At the national level the candidate is expected to have participated in some service to the discipline (e.g., organize a session at a national meeting, serve as a regular manuscript reviewer for journals, serve on an award committee, participate in the business meeting of national organizations). These service activities set the stage for continued development and leadership at all levels, including the national level.

**Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor** is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved and can be expected to maintain a sustained record of excellence in teaching, research, and service. Successful candidates will have attained a national reputation in the field through outstanding scholarship and service to the discipline. Candidates for Professor should show consistent achievement for several years before seeking promotion.

Excellence in teaching is evidenced not only through average to above average teaching evaluations and primarily positive peer evaluations but also through teaching leadership. Teaching leadership is defined broadly and can include serving as a teaching mentor for others (faculty and graduate students) in the department; working with graduate students during teaching assignments; contributing to significant curricular changes; teaching courses that are difficult to staff; extensive advising of graduate students through chairing theses and dissertations; leadership in university or national level teaching workshops; pedagogical publications; or awards or honors.

Successful candidates will have maintained an extensive research record while an associate professor. Sustained research productivity, as indicated by publications in peer reviewed journals (especially the top specialty and general journals valued by the department) and/or books published by a recognized scholarly press, are the key elements demonstrating research success. Research independence and leadership as evidenced by some solo or first authored publications is particularly desirable. Other indicators of research leadership may include editing a special issue of a journal or book; publishing work that receives awards; organizing a conference; or authoring a review article (e.g., for *Annual Review of Sociology* or *Journal of Marriage and Family* Decade in Review). Research success for promotion to Professor is indicated not solely by publications and senior authorship but also the broader impact of the faculty member's work on the field. Measures of this include citations counts and impact factor of journals. External grant receipt as an associate professor is not required but definitely attests to quality of the candidate's research agenda. Candidates should make active efforts to seek extramural support from appropriate sources given their research specialties. External reviewers will assess the candidate's prominence in the field and the department will use these external assessments to gauge the candidate's scholarly impact.



There are various research pathways to successful promotion to Full Professor. Uniting these pathways is the common thread of high research productivity and a national reputation in the field. A candidate might follow the traditional pathway of continued high scholarly output during the five or six years following tenure and promotion to Associate, coupled with the achievement of stature in the field. This type of candidate will have published more than one article (or equivalent) per year, on average, and a preponderance of the publications will be in leading specialty (or top general) journals with the candidate as first or sole author. The candidate will have an external grant, if appropriate. Another candidate's pathway could be more circuitous but would still be marked by sustained productivity over the past five or more years and recognition as a leader in the field. Again, successful candidates on this pathway would be publishing an average of more than one article per year with a sizeable share of first or sole authored in top specialty (or general) journals. They may recently have been awarded an external grant.

Substantial service to the department, university, and the profession is additionally required for promotion to Professor. Service activities should involve leadership roles, such as committee chair on departmental committees or leadership within substantive area committees. Candidates should demonstrate mentoring of faculty colleagues within the department. At the university level the successful candidate must demonstrate active involvement in committees. High quality service at the national or regional level is required and may be demonstrated by serving on editorial boards, participating on grant review panels, attending section business meetings, volunteering for committees, or being elected to committee membership. Engaged scholarship activities such as the dissemination or translation of research to larger audiences is another indicator of service at the national level.

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

For tenure and promotion cases, materials will be made available by the candidate for voting faculty and the Chair to review at least six weeks prior to the College deadline for submission. The Chair shall provide candidates with a summary table of their quantitative evaluation scores and department averages at the comparable level. The department will collate the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations and the peer evaluations. Candidates must provide their own CV as well as all other evidence of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to their teaching philosophy statement (no more than three single spaced pages in length), course materials, and summary of experience supervising undergraduate and graduate students (eg, MA /PhD committee advising or membership). Promotion dossiers also shall include a research statement (no more than three single spaced pages in length), articles, book chapters, and books published or in press, and other evidence of research productivity. Finally, candidates shall include a statement of service philosophy (no more than three single spaced pages in length) and evidence of service activities. Candidates will upload their documents into the eRPT system for electronic review by the voting faculty and Chair.

Approved by the Department/School of Sociology at the February 15, 2017 Faculty Meeting



Date 3/10/17

Name, Chair/Director

Approved:

  
Raymond Craig, Dean A&S  
Name, Dean of College Name

Date 3/14/17

Approved:



Date 3/15/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP