

# Review Process Prep Workshop

**Candidates for reappointment (EPR), and/or  
Promotion for Qualified-Rank Faculty (QRF)**

**March 2019**

# Review basics: governing documents and principles

- Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): Article 14.
- Unit Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion policy.
- Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents policy.
- Peer review and administrative review at unit level, college level, university level.
- Transparent process, policy-grounded recommendations.

# Review basics: process overview

- Information entry and upload of materials via Faculty 180 on a rolling basis (see unit RTP policy and College of Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents policy).
- Dossier submission (see College of Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents policy).
- Unit-level review and vote/recommendations: all eligible BUFGMs, unit head→...
- College-level review and recommendations: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)→Dean→...
- University-level review and recommendations: University Level Review Committee→Provost→...
- Recommendation by the President and decision by the Board of Trustees.

# Key dossier contents

- Unit RPT document.
- CV in BGSU format.
- Narratives and Signature Contributions: Teaching, Service.
- Supporting materials: Teaching, Service.
- Previous APR letters (Chair/Director and Dean) and EPR letters (C/D, Dean, provost).
- Recommendation by unit faculty, including result of eligible BUFM vote (this may be authored by a designated committee).
- Recommendation by Chair/Director.
- All PDFs, no Word documents please.

# Dossier preparation

- On or before the date that falls one calendar week prior to the candidate dossier closing deadline specified in the university-wide schedule for faculty reviews, candidates shall complete their information entry, post all materials for which they are responsible, certify completeness and accuracy, and submit the dossier to the unit head.
- The unit head shall post external evaluations (if applicable), review dossier contents, and follow up with the candidate as needed to address any dossier content questions in advance of submitting the dossier for evaluative review by eligible unit faculty members. Principal responsibility for dossier completeness and accuracy rests with the candidate.

# Unit-level process

- All unit faculty familiarize themselves with unit RTP policy and Article 14 of the CBA.
- Review and discussion of candidate dossier, in accordance with unit policy and the CBA.
- Vote by eligible BUFGMs.
  - Abstention and recusal.
- Policy-grounded recommendation by unit faculty (may be authored by designated committee), including result of eligible BUFGM vote.
- Policy-grounded recommendation by Chair/Director.

# Teaching narrative

- The teaching narrative presents the case for reappointment/promotion with reference to applicable unit policy and to evidence included in the dossier. The narrative articulates the candidate's teaching philosophy, describes pedagogical and curricular contributions in accordance with unit standards, and illustrates candidate's commitment to instructional excellence and student success.
- **Read your policy before writing your narrative.** Construct your case and select supporting evidence based on the policy standards.

# Teaching: signature contributions

- Key artifacts that document pedagogical and curricular contributions in accordance with unit standards and demonstrate candidate's commitment to instructional excellence and student success. Examples include but are not limited to representative syllabi, project assignments, samples of student work or other evidence of student achievement, documentation of curriculum development (e. g., new course/s, new program), evidence of course or program improvement through outcomes assessment work, incorporation of integrative or experiential learning, documentation of substantive teaching professional development, teaching awards or award nominations, etc.
- ***Curate these artifacts to work in concert with the teaching narrative—these are important pieces of evidence in your case.***



# Teaching: student evaluations

- It is the responsibility of the unit head or designee (not the candidate) to assemble and post student evaluation data (quantitative, qualitative, comparative summary). This includes:
  - Quantitative student evaluation data for all courses from review period, including the evaluation instrument(s).
  - Qualitative student evaluation data (student comments) from courses during the review period (minimum: three complete sets; **recommendation: all**).
  - Comparative summary of quantitative student evaluation data for the review period. This document shows how candidate data compares to course averages at a given level, of a given type, and/or in a given unit or program.
    - For dossier. unit head or designee posts this file in "Teaching – Supporting Documents." Filename: "Quantitative Student Evaluation Comparison."  
Term: Fall 2019.

# Teaching: peer evaluations

- Should be a substantive evaluation, not a description of activities.
- A peer review should be authored by a colleague of superior rank and experience, but not a supervisor. If your unit pool is limited, consult the College. Consult your unit policy as well.
- Recommended practice: reviewer and candidate meet in advance of classroom visit to review syllabus, go over objectives (for the session to be observed and for the course overall), and talk about pedagogical approach.
- Review should address *how* the material is taught as well as what is being taught.
- For dossier, combine peer evals in one PDF and post as a single file in "Teaching – Supporting Documents." Filename: "Peer Evaluations from Review Period." Term: Fall 2019.

# Service narrative and signature contributions



- The service narrative articulates the case for reappointment or promotion with reference to applicable unit policy and to materials included in the dossier. As appropriate to the case and career stage, the narrative indicates how candidate's service encompasses contributions beyond the home unit and involves leadership roles.
- Listing of signature contributions in service.
- Appropriate documentation of service accomplishments (e. g., correspondence that confirms appointment/election or acknowledges completed service, service awards). Documentation is required for major contributions (e. g., significant offices, governance leadership roles, etc.) and may be optional for smaller, occasional duties. Consult the College and/or unit policy as needed.
- Other materials in accordance with unit policy.
- **Read your policy before writing your narrative.** Construct your case and select your signature contributions based on the policy standards.



# Old policy or new?

- Does your unit have a new RTP policy, approved 2013 or after?
- Default: The policy that was in force when your appointment began is the policy that applies to your case.
- If you wish to be considered under the new policy, please prepare a memo addressed to your chair/director and the Dean.
  - Include this statement: *I am exercising my option under the Collective Bargaining Agreement to be reviewed for [reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion] under the new [unit name] reappointment, tenure, and promotion policy document, approved by the Provost on [date].*
  - Send the memo to chair/director and Dean with cc to Phil Dickinson (pdickin@bgsu.edu).
- Generally the College recommends review under the new policy.

# Faculty 180

- Access Faculty 180 via MyBGSU.
- Self-paced training reference PDFs downloadable here:  
[www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html)
- At the end of the Spring term and beginning of the Fall term, the College will hold open workshop sessions for Faculty 180. We will email details to candidates and unit heads.
- Contact the College if you have questions as you prepare your review dossier.

# New this year

- Header update in Faculty 180: **Signature Contributions**
  - Coupled with Teaching and Service narrative headers
  - Objective: to enable candidates to highlight key accomplishments in a visually intuitive way in the Fac180 dossier, increase clarity and efficiency on reviewer side
- Coming soon: spreadsheet that provides a tabular guide to what goes where in Faculty 180, based on the new header structure.

# Questions, more info

Phil Dickinson ([pdickin@bgsu.edu](mailto:pdickin@bgsu.edu))

Ted Rippey ([theodor@bgsu.edu](mailto:theodor@bgsu.edu))

Chris Bloomfield ([cbloomf@bgsu.edu](mailto:cbloomf@bgsu.edu))

702 Admin Bldg

372-2017

Arts and Sciences web site, Faculty/Staff page:

[www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html)