

## DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

### REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICIES

#### General Comments about Evaluation of Faculty

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

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

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

#### Reappointment Policy: NTTF

##### A. Policy Development

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

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

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

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

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.

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.

For EPRs, materials should 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 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.

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

#### C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

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

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

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

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

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

2. Enhanced Performance Reviews 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
3. Initial responsibility for applying established criteria of the Department's reappointment policy and making recommendations regarding reappointment following an Enhanced Performance Review rests with the tenured, probationary tenure-track, and non-tenure track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, who shall make a written recommendation to the Department Chair.
4. The Chair shall submit the written recommendations of the Department faculty to the Dean, accompanied by his/her own written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Chair disagrees with the recommendation of the unit faculty, then he/she shall state the reasons for his/her disagreement in writing.
5. Prior to submitting the Department's recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the unit faculty and the recommendation from the Chair, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
6. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the Department, the Chair's recommendation, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the faculty of the Department, the Chair's recommendation, and the college-level review

committee's recommendations to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receiving the Dean's letter.

7. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or nonrenewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
8. The decision to reappoint the faculty member, upon the completion of the Enhanced Performance Review, shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.3 of the CBA.
9. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the academic unit, the Chair, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost/VPAA determines that a non-tenure track faculty member is not performing satisfactorily, the University shall give written notice of its intention to nonrenew the employment of the affected Bargaining Unit Faculty Member and the reasons for the decision to nonrenew shall be specified, with a copy sent to the BGSU-FA.

### **Promotion Policy: NTTF**

#### **A. Eligibility**

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

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

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

#### **B. Policy Development**

The Department of Sociology shall have established written policies for promotion of NTTF members regarding: (1) the criteria used for evaluation, (2) the process for conducting and completing the evaluation for promotion, (3) the schedule or deadlines necessary for completing the evaluation and, (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit

Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the promotion process. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (5.3.2.1)

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

### C. Criteria used for Promotion Reviews of NTTF

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

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).

### D. Amendment and Retroactive Application

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

#### E. Process for Creation and Submission of Promotion Materials

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.

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

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

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



materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receiving the Dean's letter.

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

### **Reappointment Policy: TTF**

#### **A. Policy Development**

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

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

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

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

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

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 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.

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

#### C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

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

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

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair/School Director 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.

3. The review shall be submitted in writing to the Dean and to the Provost/VPAA. Included in the review shall be a statement indicating whether sufficient progress is being made toward tenure and/or promotion.
4. Prior to submitting the unit's written recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the unit's recommendation. In response, the probationary tenure track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.

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

1. Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be given an enhanced performance review at the mid-point of their probationary period. The mid-probationary enhanced performance review shall normally occur during the third year of a probationary appointment. However, in cases where a faculty member has received prior service credit (see Art. 14, section 2.2.1.6 of the CBA), the review shall occur at a time agreed upon by the appointee and the Provost/VPAA.
2. Mid-probationary enhanced performance reviews shall be conducted by the voting faculty, which are the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the Department. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, service, and librarian effectiveness (where applicable). In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. The Department faculty's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the Department Chair.
3. The Department Chair shall submit the recommendation of the unit faculty to the Dean accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation. If the Chair disagrees with the unit faculty's recommendation, he/she should state the reasons for disagreement in writing.
4. Prior to submitting the Department's recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the Department faculty and the recommendation from the Chair, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.

5. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the Department faculty, Chair, and the recommendation of the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the Department faculty, the Chair, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receiving the Dean's letter.
6. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or non-renewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
7. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the Department faculty, the Chair, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost/VPAA determines that a probationary tenure-track faculty member is not making reasonable progress toward tenure, the University shall give written notice of its intention to non-renew the employment of the affected probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member, and a copy of the notification is sent to the BGSU-FA.
8. A probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who fails to obtain a recommendation for reappointment at the end of the mid-probationary review shall receive a one (1) year terminal appointment at the end of which time, the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member shall be terminated from employment at BGSU.

### **Tenure and Promotion Policy: TTF**

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

1. The probationary tenure-track faculty candidate for tenure who has adhered to professional standards of ethics, the Ohio Code of Ethics Law, and appropriate professional codes of ethics, shall be granted or denied tenure solely on the basis of the following criteria: attainment of the terminal degree or its professional equivalent, teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative work, librarian effectiveness (where applicable), and service to the University community or profession. (6.3.1)
2. More precise statements of criteria for teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, service, and librarian effectiveness (where applicable) used for the granting or denial of tenure may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department/School. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA. (6.3.2)

Typically, candidates pursue tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously. Thus, the standards for tenure mirror those for promotion to Associate Professor. In rare cases, a

faculty member may be hired at the Associate Professor level without tenure. Criteria for tenure are the same as those for Associate Professor, as detailed in point #3 below.

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

1. Promotion in rank for tenure-track and tenured faculty members is based upon performance. Any faculty member may perform satisfactorily at a given academic rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher one. It also is recognized that a period of time will elapse after a promotion, during which time further promotion is not normally to be expected. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost/VPAA's office. In addition, faculty members whose performance merits consideration for promotion may be invited by the Chair to submit credentials for promotion review. (6.4.1)
2. The criteria for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are set forth in Article 14, Section 3. More precise statements of what is expected for promotion under teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, service, or librarian effectiveness (where applicable), may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA.
3. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

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.

#### 4. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

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.

#### C. Policy Development

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

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

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.

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

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

1. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion rests with the academic unit's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Chair.

2. The Chair shall submit the recommendation of the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and his or her written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation to the Dean. If the recommendation of the Chair differs from that of the academic unit's tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, this recommendation of the Chair shall state the reasons for the difference. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Dean. In response, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receipt.
3. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Chair, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with and the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Chair, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receipt.
4. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending approval or disapproval to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
5. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the TTF member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. Except for the tenure and promotion to associate professor evaluation occurring during the last year of the probationary appointment, the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing his or her Chair, Dean and Provost/VPAA, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for tenure and/or promotion.

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

1. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. Probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall be advised of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made and shall be given the opportunity to submit material that they believe to be pertinent to a decision.
3. Probationary tenure-track faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the period of probationary service, and denial of an early request for tenure shall have no effect on subsequent applications for tenure within the probationary period.

4. A probationary tenure-track faculty member in the last year of probationary appointment, or who presents him/herself for tenure and promotion at an earlier date, shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit (Section 6.6.5), and there shall be a single vote of recommendation for or against tenure and promotion to associate professor shall be made.
5. The academic unit's eligible voters shall consist of those Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are tenured and are at or above the rank of associate professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
6. An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure and promotion to associate professor be granted. Promotion to the rank of associate professor during the probationary period requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of all eligible voters in the academic unit because such action constitutes immediate tenure. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at or above the rank of associate professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
7. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member is a tenured assistant professor, the faculty member will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor independently of an application for tenure. In such cases, an affirmative vote of a majority of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
8. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member begins employment at BGSU as an associate professor without tenure, the faculty member may apply for tenure independently of an application for promotion. In such cases, an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

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

1. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. A tenure-track or tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who presents him/herself for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the Department.
3. The academic unit's eligible voters for candidates applying for promotion to professor shall consist of tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are at the rank of professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members holding the rank of professor from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
4. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at the rank of professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion to professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

Approved by the Department of Sociology during the February 17, 2016 faculty meeting

Chair/Director Susan Brown Date 2/17/16

Reviewed by the Dean Dagmar A. C. ... Date 2/19/16

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

Reviewed by the SVPA/Provost [Signature] Date 2/25/16

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