Arts and Sciences Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Review

Process Preparation Workshops 2018
Review basics: governing documents and principles

- Unit Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion policy document.
- Peer review and administrative review at both unit and college level.
- Transparent process, policy-grounded recommendations.
Review basics: process overview

- Solicitation and reception of external reviews (only for tenure and promotion, not for EPR).
- Assembly of materials, uploading to electronic dossier (Faculty 180). See campus-wide deadline schedule: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
- Dossier review and vote/recommendation by all eligible BUFMs; separate recommendations from eligible BUFMs and from unit Chair/Director.
- College-level review and recommendations: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC), Dean (new PTRC model started 2017-2018).
- Provost’s review and recommendation.
- Recommendation by President & Board of Trustees.
- For promotion, standard review period is all years since hire or last promotion. For EPR, standard review period is the previous two academic years.
Eligible voters

- Tenure and promotion to associate professor: all tenured faculty vote, two-thirds majority required. (CBA Art. 14, section 6.6)
- Promotion to professor: only full professors vote, simple majority required. In units with fewer than three full professors, the Dean shall appoint a committee of full professors from related disciplines, with the consent of tenured unit faculty and chair. (14.6.7)
- TTF EPR: all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.6.2.4)
- Eligible voters on leave are not required to participate, but they may opt to participate.
- Recusal vs. abstention: recusal takes a voter out of the voting pool, abstention counts as a negative vote. CBA requires recusal in certain situations, voters may request recusal if they consider it warranted.
Key dossier contents

- Unit RPT document.
- CV in BGSU format. For research & creative work, adhere carefully to the *documentation standards of your discipline*. (Candidates will build a review CV in Faculty 180 that will work for this review and be incrementally updatable for future reviews.)
- Narratives: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, Service.
- Supporting materials: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, Service.
- External reviews (for all tenure and promotion cases, not for EPR).
- Previous APR letters (chair/director and dean) and EPR letters (c/d, dean, provost; candidates for professor: use your tenure letters).
- *Recommendation* by unit faculty, including result of eligible BUFM vote (may be authored by designated committee).
- *Recommendation* by Chair/Director.
Teaching materials: required

- Narrative (max 3 pages): philosophy, professional evolution and accomplishments, future goals.

- Quantitative evaluation scores from all courses in the review period: original reports. Your courses taught will be pre-loaded in Faculty 180. Units submit original quantitative course evals to College, College links eval reports to course listings.

- Comparative synopsis of quantitative student evaluation data. This should be prepared and uploaded by the chair/director, working with the College office. Faculty 180 has a “Teaching – Supporting Documents” area for this and other supporting materials.

- Complete sets of qualitative student comments. Minimum: three courses. College preference: all courses in the review period. Check your unit policy as well.

- Three or more substantive peer reviews of teaching.

- Further evidence of teaching success. Recommendations in a later slide.

- Use the narrative to describe your trajectory and highlight signal accomplishments, with appropriate reference to the unit policy and to the evidence of teaching achievement that you have included in the dossier. Your narrative and your teaching dossier materials should work in concert.
Student evaluation data

- Original reports of all quantitative scores from the review period will be linked to course listings in Faculty 180.

- At least three (college preference: all) complete, original sets of student qualitative comments from the review period.

- Chair/Director should prepare and upload a comparative synopsis of quantitative data to the “Teaching – Supporting Documents” area of Faculty 180.

- Upload evaluation instrument(s) as well.
Student questionnaires are distributed and collected late in the semester for all courses. Respondents are assured that instructors may not view their evaluations until after grades are submitted; the instructor assigns a student to collect completed evaluations and to return them to the General Studies Writing office. Questions 1-8 evaluate instructor performance. There is no corresponding numerical value for question 9. However, it provides qualitative feedback on the course and/or instructor’s strengths and weaknesses. Questions 1-8 are as follows:

- The degree to which your instructor prepared you to write your major papers
- The usefulness of your instructor’s assignment sheets/handouts
- The helpfulness of your instructor’s explanations and examples
- The degree to which your instructor allowed you to ask questions and express opinions
- The value of one-on-one time during class, conferences, email, phone calls
- The effectiveness of your instructor’s feedback regarding your writing
- The degree to which your instructor helped to improve your writing abilities
- The overall rating of the instructor based on class atmosphere, instructor preparedness, knowledge of material and enjoyment of teaching
- Instructor strengths and weaknesses and suggested changes for the course/instructor

In the grid below, the course number is listed in the left column, with the number of students who completed the evaluation indicated in parentheses. The instructor’s scores for questions 1-8 can be read from left to right, with the General Studies Writing Program’s average score response for undergraduate courses listed in parentheses below each score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>6.18(6.47)</td>
<td>5.64(6.24)</td>
<td>6.18(6.53)</td>
<td>6.82(6.69)</td>
<td>6.45(6.54)</td>
<td>6.18(6.53)</td>
<td>6.27(6.52)</td>
<td>6.45(6.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>6.73(6.47)</td>
<td>6.27(6.24)</td>
<td>6.67(6.53)</td>
<td>6.57(6.69)</td>
<td>6.80(6.54)</td>
<td>6.73(6.53)</td>
<td>6.80(6.52)</td>
<td>6.80(6.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100E</td>
<td>6.91(6.47)</td>
<td>6.91(6.24)</td>
<td>6.82(6.53)</td>
<td>7.00(6.69)</td>
<td>6.64(6.54)</td>
<td>6.82(6.53)</td>
<td>6.82(6.52)</td>
<td>6.91(6.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>6.35(6.04)</td>
<td>6.59(5.91)</td>
<td>6.53(6.06)</td>
<td>6.65(6.45)</td>
<td>6.76(6.17)</td>
<td>6.59(6.05)</td>
<td>6.76(6.08)</td>
<td>6.76(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>6.71(6.04)</td>
<td>6.29(5.91)</td>
<td>6.50(6.06)</td>
<td>6.71(6.45)</td>
<td>6.79(6.17)</td>
<td>6.86(6.05)</td>
<td>6.29(6.08)</td>
<td>6.64(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>6.41(6.04)</td>
<td>6.53(5.91)</td>
<td>6.35(6.06)</td>
<td>6.41(6.45)</td>
<td>6.18(6.17)</td>
<td>6.47(6.05)</td>
<td>6.47(6.08)</td>
<td>6.76(6.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer reviews of teaching

■ 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.
Further evidence of teaching success: recommendations

- Well-crafted syllabi, assignments, projects.
- Documentation of teaching innovation, including implementation of high-impact practices.
- Documentation of curricular review/development.
- Documentation of contributions to outcomes and assessment work.
- Samples of student work that illustrate progress toward program learning outcomes.
- Results of graduate or undergraduate research or creative mentorship (student work, awards, publications, exhibition).
- Evidence of significant professional development.
- Teaching awards or award nominations.

Curate these materials in order to provide reviewers with a multidimensional image of your teaching: positive impact on student learning and student success, signature achievements, overall contribution to the instructional mission. Your narrative and your curated teaching materials should work in concert.
Research/creative materials

- Narrative (3 pages): Describe your scholarly/creative agenda and trajectory, highlight signal achievements. Make appropriate reference to unit policy.

- All substantive publications/creative works from review period. Use the narrative to direct reviewer attention to key contributions.

- Evidence of external funding: documentation of secured awards, applications, agency feedback.

- External reviews: letters (signed, on letterhead), reviewer CVs, explanation of reviewer selection process. Chair/Director organizes and posts these materials.

- Full professor cases: Assessment of quantity should focus on record since tenure. Evaluation of quality should take entire body of work into account, with emphasis on work since tenure.
Research/creative work narrative

■ Before writing, go over the research/creative criteria in your unit policy. Make appropriate reference to policy in the narrative.

■ Describe and contextualize your work in language that is accessible to readers outside your field.

■ Provide a sense of scholarly/creative trajectory. The College expects tenure candidates to demonstrate an independent program of scholarship/creative work and candidates for professor to demonstrate a national/international reputation in the discipline. Unit policies provide specific criteria.

■ Provide evidence that your work is valued in the discipline.
External Reviews
Only for tenure & promotion to associate and promotion to professor

- Follow university-wide guidelines:
  www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/faculty-affairs/documents/soliciting-external-ltrs-process.pdf

- The terminology in the guidelines is geared toward research and scholarship, but the principles apply to creative disciplines as well. If you are an artist, for instance, read “active and influential scholars in the field” as “active and influential artists in the field.”

- If your research blends creative work and scholarship and/or incorporates a community-based/scholarship of engagement element, consult your unit policy and talk with the College about external review and dossier prep.

- The guidelines make reference to the “Dean or designee.” In Arts and Sciences, the Chair/Director serves as the Dean’s designee.
Service materials

Service Narrative (1-2 pages)

- State your philosophy of service.
- Describe service activities and your contributions to the department, college and university.
- Include service to groups on campus or to the community—as long as these involve your academic expertise.
- Include service to your discipline/the profession (professional society or organization, editorial board work, manuscript or proposal review, jurying, external or program review work, etc.).
- Indicate some service goals for the future.
- Make appropriate reference to unit policy.

Include relevant supporting materials (e.g., letters of appointment/acknowledgment or other documentation). Materials can be linked to entries in the review CV in Faculty 180.

Provide accurate dates for service duties listed in CV.

Service expectation is greater for promotion to professor. Service leadership provides a good distinction.
Old policy or new?

- Does your unit have a new RTP policy, approved since the implementation of the first CBA (2013)?

- 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 Ted Rippey.

- Generally the College recommends review under the new policy.
Faculty 180: new digital system for activity reporting and review processes

- Access coming soon via MyBGSU. Target date: April 9.
- Register for training via the CFE here: [www.bgsu.edu/center-for-faculty-excellence/find-a-workshop1/faculty-180-training.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/center-for-faculty-excellence/find-a-workshop1/faculty-180-training.html)
- Self-paced training reference PDFs downloadable here: [www.firelands.bgsu.edu/faculty180/training.html](http://www.firelands.bgsu.edu/faculty180/training.html)
- See a demo here: [www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources/faculty-180-demonstration.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources/faculty-180-demonstration.html)
- At the end of the Spring term and beginning of the Fall term, the College will hold open group work/troubleshooting 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.
Questions / more info

Ted Rippey (theodor@bgsu.edu)
Phil Dickinson (pdickin@bgsu.edu)
Chris Bloomfield (cbloomf@bgsu.edu)
702 Admin Bldg
372-2017

Arts and Sciences web site, Faculty/Staff page:
http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html