Arts and Sciences Faculty Review Handbook

2025-2026 Review Cycle

Updated Feb 17, 2025

Contents

I. Candidate Responsibilities – pg. 2

II. Unit Responsibilities: Eligible Faculty – pg. 7

III. Unit Responsibilities: Chair or Director – pg. 9

IV. College Responsibilities: Faculty Advancement Team – pg. 12

V. College Responsibilities: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee – pg. 13

VI. College Responsibilities: Dean – pg. 15

Appendices

A. Review Process: Sequential Overview – pg. 16

B. Candidate Preparatory Exercises – pg. 18

C. Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents Policy – pg. 20

D. Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180 – pg. 23 ("Activities" Area: pg. 23; "Profile" Area: pg. 28)

I. Candidate Responsibilities

A. Know your policies and guidelines

(For links to these materials see www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html)

1. Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): Article 14
2. Unit Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) policy (clarify: 2006 policy or post-CBA policy), hereafter "unit policy"
3. University guidelines for soliciting external letters of review (if applicable), hereafter "external review guidelines"
4. Arts and Sciences Dossier Preparation and Contents policy, hereafter "college dossier policy"
5. Arts and Sciences Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180

B. Understand your access

1. Your opportunity to edit and make changes to your dossier concludes once you submit your dossier.
2. Faculty 180 provides viewing access throughout process—except for external reviews.
    a. You will see recommendations from eligible unit faculty, unit head, the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC), Dean, University Level Review Committee (if applicable), and Provost.
    b. If external reviews apply in your case, access will be granted after the candidate dossier closing date of September 30th.

C. Know your rights

1. Candidates have the opportunity to respond via rebuttal to unit and college recommendations. The rebuttal window is 3 business days, following the conclusion of the unit stage and the conclusion of the college stage.
2. Candidates have recourse via grievance and arbitration at the conclusion of the review process. See Article 13 and Article 14, Section 11 of CBA.
3. Candidates participate in external reviewer selection process (if applicable).
    a. Review your unit policy and unit procedures.
    b. Review the University guidelines for soliciting external letters of review (see external review guidelines).
    c. Be attentive to reviewer and institution profile.

d. Watch COI.

e. **Avoid all contact with prospective reviewers** throughout the selection process and your candidacy.

f. **Candidate-solicited letters of reference or recommendation are not appropriate.**

D. Prepare your dossier

1. "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" (college dossier policy).
2. Principal responsibility for **dossier completeness and accuracy rests with the candidate**.
    a. Issues with completeness and accuracy will complicate the work of reviewers and raise questions about the legitimacy of your case.
    b. Misrepresentation of professional accomplishments is in conflict with CBA Article 9, Section 2.
3. Key dossier contents:
    a. CV in BGSU format (www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/documents/faculty-resources/Standard-BGSU-CV.pdf)
    b. Unit policy (clarify policy choice if applicable)
    c. Original appointment letter ("hire letter," i. e., not your annual salary letter[s])
    d. Teaching, Scholarly/Creative (if applicable), and Service materials
        i. Narratives
        ii. Signature Contributions files
        iii. Further materials as specified by unit policy and/or college dossier policy
    e. Previous review letters
        i. If you are having difficulty locating original appointment and/or previous review letters, contact Chris Bloomfield or the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.
        ii. See the Arts and Sciences Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180 for specific guidance on previous review letters required for your case.

iii. Your annual salary letter is not a review letter. Review letters are **APR** (Unit Head and Dean), **EPR** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost), **promotion** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost), or **tenure** (Unit Head, Dean, Provost) letters.

4. Dossier materials that are handled by unit head or designee
    a. External reviews (if applicable)
    b. Student evaluations
5. Your dossier is set up in accordance with the **review period** for your case.
    a. Do not expect work outside the review period to be credited in the review process—and do not base your case in whole or in part on such work.
    b. If you have prior service credit, be sure to check in with your chair/director and the faculty advancement team so we can set up your dossier accordingly.
6. Candidates and unit heads: The candidacy and the review process are best served by a **clean, coherent dossier.**
    a. Follow the Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180 (link in Section A above).
    b. Ask the Dean's Office faculty advancement team if you have questions about posting location, naming conventions, etc.

E. Your dossier: Teaching

1. Know the applicable policy standards and show how your record of achievement meets those standards.
    a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise (see Appendix B below) to create a framework and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.
2. Narrative: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions, i.e., further evidence of teaching development and accomplishments: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 7.
    a. Signature Contributions enable candidates to highlight key accomplishments in an intuitive way in the dossier and improve focus, clarity, and efficiency on reviewer side.
    b. Assemble your Signature Contributions artifacts in one integral PDF, with a Table of Contents, sequenced in the order that they are discussed in narrative.
4. Student evaluation data: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, points 2 – 5.
5. Peer reviews of teaching: See college dossier policy, Teaching section, point 6.

6. List further information and post further materials as called for by unit policy.

F. Your dossier: Scholarly/Creative Work (if applicable)

1. Know the applicable policy standards and show how your record of achievement meets those standards.
    a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise to create a framework and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.
2. Narrative: See college dossier policy, Research/Creative Work section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions: Key research/creative contributions that demonstrate the coherence, quality, and impact of the work during the review period, based on discipline-appropriate indicators (e.g., impact factor, h-index, citations, awards, reputation of venue).
    a. Signature contributions enable candidates to highlight key accomplishments in an intuitive way in the dossier and improve focus, clarity, and efficiency on reviewer side.
    b. Signature Contributions are usually a subset of the comprehensive set of publications from the review period, but in some instances the comprehensive set and the signature contributions may be the same.
    c. Assemble your signature contributions documents in one integral PDF, with a Table of Contents, sequenced in the order that they are discussed in narrative.
4. All substantive publications from review period: See college dossier policy, Research/Creative Work section, point 2.
5. Candidates for Professor: Clarify the extent to which any work captured in the review period was considered in the evaluation for tenure. Use the “Description” feature in Faculty 180 to do so. Consult the Associate Dean for Faculty Development as needed.
6. Guidance for QRF candidates who wish to incorporate research and/or creative work in their dossier:
    a. Frame this work in relation to and in connection with your accomplishments in teaching and/or service.
    b. Review your unit policy carefully. Some policies have specific language regarding this matter.

G. Your dossier: Service

1. Know the applicable policy standards and show how your record of achievement meets those standards.

   a. Recommendation: Do the prep exercise to create a framework and cite the applicable policy standards as appropriate in your narrative.

2. Service narrative: See college dossier policy, Service section, point 1.
3. Signature Contributions: The major roles and accomplishments that convey the value and impact of your service work in unit, college, university, professional, and/or community contexts and demonstrate how that service work has met the policy-based standards during the review period.
   a. The balance, type, and setting of the signature contributions in service will vary according to case type and career stage.
   b. If you have questions regarding documentation of service accomplishments, see college dossier policy, Service section, point 2 and consult the Dean's Office as needed.
4. List other service information and post other service materials in accordance with unit policy.
5. Candidates for Professor: Clarify the extent to which any work captured in the review period was considered in the evaluation for tenure. Use the "Description" feature in Faculty 180 to do so. Consult the Dean's Office as needed.

H. Make a cogent, policy-based case

1. The candidate makes the case through
   a. narratives that reference unit policy standards
   b. carefully selected and assembled signature contributions files that work in concert with the narratives
   c. further materials and information as specified by unit and college policies
   d. complete and accurate dossier assembly
2. The candidate prep exercises will equip you to see for yourself how you can make an effective case.

II. Unit Responsibilities: Eligible Faculty

A. Know your policies and guidelines

1. Eligible faculty have an obligation to know the applicable language of the contract and the applicable language of the unit policy for the different review types in which they participate.
2. Review applicable language in advance of reviewing dossiers.
3. For links to pertinent policies and guidelines see www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html

B. Fulfill your charge

1. Participate in external reviewer selection process (if applicable), as specified by University external review guidelines and unit policy.
2. Participate as eligible in dossier review and voting: **this is a contractual duty.**
    a. An **abstention** or a **failure to vote** is tabulated as a **negative vote.**
    b. For tenure, a 2/3 majority is required. For all other cases, a simple majority suffices.
        i. Scenario: Professor X is up for promotion. There are 10 eligible voters. 5 vote in favor, 3 vote against, 3 abstain or skip the vote. The faculty recommendation is negative.
    c. Regarding the possibility of **recusal** due to approved leave, COI, conflict under the Amorous Relationships policy, or other reasons**,** see pertinent language in CBA Article 14 and consult the College as needed.
        i. Scenario: Professor Y is up for promotion. There are 10 eligible voters. 5 vote in favor, 4 vote against, 1 is recused due to FIL. Professor Y has just received a positive faculty recommendation.
3. Participate in drafting and finalizing written recommendation, in accordance with unit policy and procedures.

C. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply unit policy standards in your evaluation of the dossier.
2. Focus on the review period.
3. Write a **policy-based recommendation** that cites the policy as appropriate.
4. Document the vote in your recommendation.
    a. Clarify whether any eligible voters were recused due to approved leave or other reasons.

   b. Report the vote in specific terms (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions).

5. Bear in mind: a candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluation than by vague praise. If issues or concerns are evident in the body of work that is captured in the dossier, address those issues or concerns and discuss how the candidate has or has not responded to them.

III. Unit Responsibilities: Chair or Director

A. Coordinate external review (if applicable)

1. Follow university-wide "External Reviews for Promotion and Tenure" guidelines posted here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
    a. Be attentive to
        i. recognized reputation
        ii. active and influential status
        iii. requisite rank
        iv. peer or aspirant institutions
    b. Avoid COI and appearances of COI.
    c. Engage candidate and unit tenured faculty in the process as called for.
2. 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."
3. If candidate's research blends creative work and scholarship and/or incorporates a community-based/scholarship of engagement element, then review pertinent policy language carefully and consult the Dean's Office as needed regarding external review, dossier prep, etc.
4. Guidelines points 9 and 11 refer to the "Dean or designee." In Arts and Sciences, the Chair/Director serves as the Dean's designee for these functions.
5. External reviews should be on university letterhead, signed/scanned or electronically signed by the reviewer.
6. Posting external reviews:
    a. Combine reviewer CVs into a single PDF and post as "Candidate Lastname External Reviewer CVs".
    b. Combine review letters into a single PDF and post as "Candidate Lastname External Review Letters".
    c. Unit heads post external reviews after candidate has submitted and before unit faculty review begins.

B. Support, oversee, and play your designated role in dossier preparation

1. See candidate dossier guidance in Part I, Sections D through H above and provide support as needed.

2. The candidate is required by college policy to submit dossier to you "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" (college dossier policy).
3. "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" (college dossier policy).
    a. If you have concerns about completeness and accuracy, advise your candidate to gather or update materials asap.
    b. Consult the Dean's Office as needed, both on how to handle dossier updates and on issues of policy.
    c. If completeness and accuracy issues persist due to ineffective response or no response from candidate, note the issues in your written recommendation and weigh them appropriately.
    d. If completeness and accuracy issues rise to the level of intentional misrepresentation, consult the Dean's Office re: possible responses under the CBA.

C. Guide the unit

1. See eligible faculty responsibilities in Part II above.
2. Provide direction and support as called for. Consult the Dean's Office as needed.

D. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply unit policy standards in your evaluation.
2. Focus on the review period.
3. Write an **independent, policy-based recommendation** that cites the policy standards in teaching, research/creative (if applicable), and service and explains how the record—as captured in the dossier—does or does not meet the standards.
4. If the unit faculty recommendation does not do so, then be sure to:
    a. Clarify whether any eligible voters did not participate due to approved leave or recusal.
    b. **Report the vote in specific terms** (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions).
5. Bear in mind: a candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluation than by vague praise. If issues or concerns are evident

in the body of work that is captured in the dossier, address those issues or concerns and discuss how the candidate has or has not responded to them.

IV. College Responsibilities: Dean's Office (Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Assistant to the Associate Dean)

A. Guide the Candidates, Chairs and Directors, and PTRC

1. Provide guidance to candidates throughout the RPT process, beginning with preparation workshops in the spring prior to dossier submission, and ending once cases advance beyond the college.
2. Provide guidance to candidates who choose to file a rebuttal to the Chair/Director recommendation or the Dean's recommendation.
3. Provide guidance to Chairs and Directors regarding CBA questions, college policies and practices, and issues with individual cases.
4. Provide guidance to the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) regarding PTRC guidelines, university-wide guidelines for college-level review committees, application of unit RPT policies, and issues with individual cases.

B. Manage the college-level RPT process

1. Set up and manage Faculty 180 process for submitting and reviewing dossier materials.
2. Ensure process is completed according to the university-level "evergreen" calendar for RPT processes.
3. Assist PTRC with scheduling meetings and accessing materials in Faculty 180.

C. Contribute to process improvement

1. Consider and evaluate the efficacy of college-level policies and procedures.
2. Solicit feedback from PTRC regarding efficacy of process and policies.
3. Suggest and develop changes to the process as warranted.
4. Provide regular RPT workshops for faculty candidates and appropriate guidance for Chairs/Directors.

V. College Responsibilities: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

A. Be familiar with unit policies and guidelines

1. Committee members have an obligation to know the applicable language of the contract and the applicable language of the unit policies for the different types of faculty review cases in which they participate. The applicable policy document for a given case will be posted in the candidate's dossier.

2. Review applicable language in advance of reviewing dossiers.

3. For links to pertinent policies and guidelines, see: www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-seven/section-7-1.html.

B. Fulfill your charge

1. Participate in dossier review and voting, as eligible, on all Enhanced Performance Review (EPR), tenure, and promotion cases in the College.

2. Participate in drafting and finalizing written recommendations, in accordance with Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC) rules.

C. Review and recommend, guided by policy

1. Apply applicable unit policy standards in your evaluation of the dossier.

2. Focus on the review period.

3. Write an **independent, policy-based recommendation** that cites the applicable unit policy as appropriate.

4. PTRC members do not vote on cases from their own units (see CBA Article 14, Sections 6.2.4.3, 6.4.3.2, 7.5.1).

5. Document the unit vote, unit recommendation, and unit head recommendation in your own recommendation, and do so in specific terms (e.g., 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions). Clarify whether eligible voters at the unit level were recused due to approved leave or other reasons.

6. Document the PTRC vote in specific terms (e.g., 4 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 recusal, 0 abstentions).

7. Bear in mind that both the candidacy and the process are better served by dispassionate, policy-grounded evaluations than vague praise. **Cite specific policy-grounded evidence from the dossier to support your recommendation**.

VI. College Responsibilities: Dean

A. Guide the Associate Dean and the Assistant to the Associate Dean

1. Provide guidance to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Assistant to the Associate Dean regarding any process changes you wish to see, based on the previous cycle.
2. Provide guidance to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Assistant to the Associate Dean regarding any new practices you wish to see implemented for the upcoming cycle.
3. Respond to the team's queries regarding general matters of policy and practice and/or issues with a particular case.

B. Charge the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)

1. Meet with the faculty advancement team and the members of the PTRC at the beginning of the review cycle to
    a. Discuss PTRC responsibilities (see Section V above) and
    b. Share your understanding of the purpose and value of PTRC's work

C. Review and recommend, guided by policies

1. Evaluate candidate dossiers in accordance with the CBA, applying the appropriate unit policy standards in each case.
2. Review the recommendations of unit faculty, unit head, and PTRC.
3. Write an independent, policy-based recommendation for each case.

D. Contribute to process improvement

1. Confer with and/or offer feedback to the following groups or individuals at the conclusion of the cycle, in the interest of promoting process improvement from year to year:
    a. Chairs and Directors
    b. Assoc Dean, Asst to Assoc Dean
    c. PTRC
    d. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Appendix A: Review Process Overview

Process steps

1. Information entry and upload of materials via Faculty 180 on a rolling basis
2. Solicitation and reception of external reviews (if applicable)
    a. Follow external review guidelines posted here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
3. Dossier submission
4. Dossier review, vote, and written recommendation by eligible unit faculty
5. Dossier review and written recommendation by unit head
6. First rebuttal window: 3 business days following conclusion of unit-level process
7. Dossier review, vote, and written recommendation by Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)
    a. PTRC is a committee of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, three from each disciplinary division of the College
    b. Details on membership and deliberation are found here: www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty/cdh/section-two/section-2-3.html
8. Dossier review and written recommendation by Dean
9. Second rebuttal window: 3 business days following conclusion of college-level process
10. Dossier review and written advice to Provost by University-Level Review Committee (ULRC)
    a. Only for cases in which there has been at least one negative recommendation at previous levels
    b. ULRC is a committee of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, two from each college
    c. ULRC guidelines are linked here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html
11. Dossier review and written recommendation by Provost
12. Recommendation by President to Board of Trustees
13. Decision by Board of Trustees

Process timetable and deadlines

See the "Evergreen" calendar linked here: www.bgsu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/faculty-administrators-info-and-resources.html

Appendix B: Review Candidate Preparatory Exercises

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

As a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, you are faced with a challenging task of assembling a focused dossier that captures your body of work and presents a persuasive case. This challenge is also an opportunity: to represent and reinforce for yourself and for your reviewers why you do what you do, your key contributions to the institution and the profession, and how your work during the review period aligns with the standards for your review.

Based on one-on-one consultations with a number of individual candidates over the years, we recommend the following preparatory exercise before you assemble your dossier materials.

1. Familiarize yourself with Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Familiarize yourself with your unit's policy on reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
3. Sit down with a copy of your CV and a copy of your unit policy and highlight the applicable language to your case. Be attentive to both **quantitative** and **qualitative** standards and framing language.
4. Go through your CV and highlight key accomplishments that align with both the qualitative and the qualitative standards.
5. Formulate bullet-style notes that could serve as key points an argument for how your body of work meets the standards in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. Again, be attentive to both qualitative and quantitative standards.
6. Use your bullet-style notes as guidance and material for your narratives.

This exercise is not compulsory and your bullets and notes need not submitted to anyone. We recommend it because it can help you start working in concrete ways to make the policy-grounded case that your accomplishments meet the standards for a given review. You may also find that it establishes a productive basis for guidance conversations with your unit head, a mentor, and/or an associate dean.

Too often candidates experience a review process as something over which they have no control. This is not accurate. As a candidate you are empowered to make your case, and this prep exercise can help you do that.

Qualified Rank Faculty

As a candidate for reappointment or promotion, you are faced with the challenge of assembling a dossier that captures your body of work and presents a persuasive case to reviewers. This challenge is also an opportunity for you to represent and reinforce—both

for yourself and for your reviewers— why you do what you do, your key contributions to your institution and profession, and how your work during the review period aligns with the standards for your review.

Based on our conversations with candidates who have gone through this process over the years, we recommend you spend time completing the following exercise before you assemble your dossier materials.

1. Familiarize yourself with Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
2. Familiarize yourself with your unit's policy on reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
3. Sit down with a copy of your CV and a copy of your unit policy and highlight the applicable language to your case. Be attentive to both **quantitative** and **qualitative** standards and framing language.
4. Go through your CV and highlight key accomplishments that align with both the qualitative and the qualitative standards.
5. Formulate bullet-style notes that provide key evidence for the argument that your body of work over the review period meets your unit's standards in the areas of teaching and service. Again, be attentive to both qualitative and quantitative standards. (Note: For those QRF colleagues with an active research/creative agenda, this is your opportunity to frame how this work connects to your accomplishments in teaching, teaching-related, and/or service activities).
6. Use your bullet-style notes as guidance and material for your narratives.

This exercise is not compulsory and your bullets and notes are for your use as a candidate. This exercise will help you make a broader policy-grounded case for reappointment/promotion, which frames your teaching and service narratives and your record of accomplishments within your unit's standards for review. You may also find that this activity builds a productive basis for an ongoing dialogue with your unit head, a mentor, and/or associate dean about your role in the professional life of your unit and university.

Too often, we have found, candidates feel like they have little control over the review process. This is not so. As a candidate you are empowered to make the most compelling argument possible to support your case. Taking the time to complete this exercise will empower you to do that.

Appendix C: College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Dossier Preparation and Contents

The College of Arts and Sciences encompasses seventeen academic units and is home to over 400 full- time faculty. This policy serves the interest of fairness, consistency, and accuracy across all review types, ranks, disciplines, and programs. It is intended to augment and align with unit reappointment, tenure, and promotion policies and Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

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.

Required Dossier Contents

Teaching

- Teaching narrative that presents the case for reappointment/tenure/promotion with reference to applicable unit policy and to materials 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.
- Quantitative student evaluation data for all courses from review period.
- 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.
- Student evaluation data (quantitative, qualitative, comparative summary) shall be assembled and posted by the unit head or designee. The candidate may not serve as the designee.

- Peer reviews of teaching (minimum three) conducted during review period by a colleague of equal or superior rank who is not the candidate's supervisor at the time of the peer review. If the unit pool is limited, consult the College.
- Further evidence of teaching development and accomplishments: key artifacts that document pedagogical and curricular contributions in accordance with unit standards and demonstrate candidate's commitment to instructional excellence and student success. The teaching narrative and these artifacts should work in concert. Examples include but are not limited to syllabi, project assignments, samples of student work or other evidence of student achievement, documentation of curriculum development (e. g., new course, new program), evidence of course or program improvement through outcomes assessment work, incorporation of integrative or experiential learning, documentation of substantive teaching professional development, etc.
- Other materials in accordance with unit policy.

Research/Creative Work (if applicable to the case)

- Research/Creative narrative that articulates the case for reappointment or tenure and/or promotion with reference to applicable unit policy; the narrative explains the coherence of the research/creative activity agenda, referring to scholarly publications, creative works, and/or equivalent products included in the dossier and delineating the contribution to the discipline. The narrative also describes the quality and impact of the work, with reference to discipline- appropriate indicators (e. g., impact factor, h-index, citations, awards, reputation of venue). Individual works cited in the research/creative narrative should represent the major themes, emphases, and contributions of the candidate's overall body of work.
- In all cases, the electronic dossier that serves as the basis for the BGSU review process shall contain all substantive scholarly publications, creative works, and/or equivalent products from the review period. If a selection of publications, creative works, and/or equivalent products is sent for external review, consult the College regarding process.
- Documentation of grants (if applicable to the case). Include OSPR tracking number and specify BGSU share of awards made to multi-institution teams.
- Other materials in accordance with unit policy.

Service

- Service narrative that articulates the case for reappointment or tenure and/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.
- 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, editorial board service, etc.) and may be optional for smaller, occasional duties (e. g., manuscript review). Consult the College and/or unit policy as needed.

- Other materials in accordance with unit policy.

Endorsements

Endorsed by Arts and Sciences Council, Feb. 2, 2019
[Vibha Bhalla, Chair, 2018 – 2019, Signed March 27, 2019]
Endorsed by Arts and Sciences Council of Chairs and Directors, Mar. 15, 2019
[Michael Zickar, Chair, 2018 – 2019, Signed Mar. 15, 2019]
Approved by the Dean, Mar. 15, 2019
[Raymond A. Craig, Dean, Signed Mar. 15, 2019

Appendix D: Guide to Posting Materials in Faculty 180

College of Arts and Sciences – RTP Cases – February 2025

"Activities" Area of Faculty 180

Curriculum Vitae

Post a PDF of your career-spanning CV here.

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Narrative and Signature Contributions

Narrative

The Teaching Narrative articulates the case for reappointment/tenure/promotion with reference to applicable unit policy and to evidence included in the dossier. It articulates the candidate's teaching philosophy, describes pedagogical and curricular contributions in accordance with unit standards, and illustrates the candidate's commitment to instructional excellence and student success. Requested length limit 3 pages. PDF.

Signature Contributions

Signature Contributions are key artifacts that document pedagogical and curricular contributions in accordance with unit standards and demonstrate the 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, new program), evidence of course or program improvement through outcomes assessment work, incorporation of integrative or experiential learning, documentation of substantive teaching professional development, etc. Curate these artifacts to work in concert with the teaching narrative—these are significant pieces of evidence in your case.
Combine files into ONE INTEGRAL PDF--including a table of contents--and post. Refer to signature contributions in your narrative. Align the order of contents with the order in which the materials are discussed in the narrative.

Scholarly/Creative Activity Narrative and Signature Contributions

Narrative

The Scholarly/Creative Narrative articulates the case for reappointment/tenure/promotion with reference to applicable unit policy. It explains the coherence of the research/creative activity agenda, referring to scholarly publications, creative works, and/or equivalent products included in the dossier and delineating the

contribution to the discipline. The narrative also describes the quality and impact of the work, with reference to discipline-appropriate indicators (e. g., impact factor, h-index, citations, awards, reputation of venue). Individual works cited in the research/creative narrative should represent the major themes, emphases, and contributions of the candidate's overall body of work. Remember that the research narrative will have many readers outside your field. Requested length limit 3 pages. PDF.

Signature Contributions

Signature contributions convey the major themes, emphases, and disciplinary or interdisciplinary value of the candidate's body of work. The set of research/creative products selected as signature contributions should demonstrate the quality and impact of the work, based on discipline-appropriate indicators (e. g., impact factor, h-index, citations, awards, reputation of venue).
Combine files into ONE INTEGRAL PDF--including a table of contents--and post. Refer to signature contributions in your narrative. Align the order of contents with the order in which the materials are discussed in the narrative.

Service Narrative and Signature Contributions

Narrative

The Service Narrative articulates the case for reappointment/tenure/promotion with reference to applicable unit policy and to evidence included in the dossier. As appropriate to the case and career stage, the narrative indicates how service encompasses contributions beyond the home unit and involves leadership roles. Requested length limit 3 pages. PDF.

Signature Contributions

Signature Contributions are the major roles and accomplishments that convey the value and impact of the candidate's service work in unit, college, university, professional, and/or community contexts and demonstrate how that service work has met the policy-based standards during the review period. The balance, type, and setting of the signature contributions in service will vary according to case type and career stage. Combine files into ONE INTEGRAL PDF--including a table of contents--and post. Refer to signature contributions in your narrative. Align the order of contents with the order in which the materials are discussed in the narrative.

Teaching

Course listings pulled from CSS. If you see courses you did not teach OR if you do not see courses that you did teach, notify the college faculty development team (Ted Rippey & Chris Bloomfield).

Teaching – Supporting Documents

Materials not included in signature contributions. Be judicious. Add materials here only if they are required by unit policy and/or essential to your case. Do not post teaching evaluations here.

Teaching – Evaluations

Comparative overview of quantitative student eval data from review period: Prepared and posted by unit head or designee (not candidate) with appropriate staff support. Set the first term of the review period as "Start Semester" and the last term of the review period as "End Semester." Filename: "Lastname Firstname Quantitative Evaluation Comparison." Include a copy of the evaluation instrument(s).
Quantitative evals for all courses from review period: Collation and upload handled by unit head with appropriate staff support. Quant evals from a given academic year or semester should be combined in a single PDF and posted each academic year or each semester. Filename for each one-year file: "Lastname Firstname Quantitative Evaluations XXXX-XXXX" (e. g., 2019-2020). Filename for each semester file: "Lastname Firstname Quantitative Evaluations SEMESTER XXXX" (e. g., Fall 2020). The College encourages combination of quantitative and qualitative evals. If quant and qual evals are combined, use the filename "Lastname Firstinitial Combined Student Evaluations XXXX-XXXX or SEMESTER XXXX" (e.g., "Rippey T Combined Student Evaluations 2020-2021" or "...Fall 2020").
Peer evaluations from the review period: Combine into one PDF. Set the first term of the review period as "Start Semester" and the last term of the review period as "End Semester." Filename: "Lastname Firstname Peer Evaluations". Note in the "Description" text field the semesters/years when the peer evals were conducted.

Teaching Outside Bowling Green State University

Organized courses taught at other institutions, either prior to BGSU appointment or while on visiting appointments during time at BGSU. Information on teaching outside BGSU is not required.

Graduate Student Supervision/Mentoring

Individual listings for committee membership or supervisory roles in master's projects or theses and doctoral dissertations.

Undergraduate Student Supervision/Mentoring

Individual listings for supervisory roles in undergraduate research/creative projects, theses.

Curriculum Development

Documentation of new course development and/or major course revisions.
Documentation of contributions to new program development and/or major program revisions.

Professional Development

Documentation of PD courses, workshops, conferences, etc.

Student Advising

Cohort/group advising. Enter number of students per term.

Grants

Grant listings and appropriate documentation. Enter OSPR proposal ID#. List only BGSU award amount or list total award and use Description field to clarify BGSU share of award. Use this area ONLY FOR GRANTS, not for non-competitive funding like college or unit conference travel support money.

Scholarly Contributions and Creative Productions

Post all substantive publications/creative products from review period. Check completeness and accuracy of listing info, follow disciplinary standards (see CBA Article 9, Sections 2.3 and 2.4). Upload PDFs or enter hyperlinks for all substantive pubs/creative products. The system dropdowns capture a range of product types. If you have a type of product that the Faculty 180 dropdowns do not include, use "Other" or talk with your chair/director and contact college faculty development team (Ted Rippey & Chris Bloomfield) to request update of the dropdowns.

Institutional Committees & Service

Enter listings for committee or other formal group service (Faculty Senate, task forces, councils, working groups, etc.) at unit, college, or university level, with appropriate documentation. You can click the blue “Change” button to switch between university, college, and dept/school level, each of which has a tailored dropdown that lists various committees for that level. If you have a type of service that the Faculty 180 dropdowns do not include, use "Other" or contact faculty development team (Ted Rippey & Chris Bloomfield) to request update of the dropdowns

Other Institutional Service

Enter listings for individual service assignments or volunteer contributions at unit, college, or university level, with appropriate documentation. Examples: peer mentorship work, engagement in recruitment and outreach, unit posts such as assoc chair, graduate coordinator, etc. You can change between university, college, and dept/school level, entry by entry.

Professional Service

Enter listings for discipline or profession-based service roles, with appropriate documentation. Examples: office in a professional organization, conference organization, editorial board service, manuscript reviewer, etc.

Community Engagement

Enter listings for community-based service roles that draw on academic expertise and/or work that brings your expertise to a broader public discussion. List media appearances in this category.

Other Service

Use only as a fallback if none of the above service areas works.

Consulting

Enter listings of completed or ongoing projects, with appropriate documentation. Use only for formal consulting with client contracts.

Previous Evaluations and Reappointment Letters

QRF EPR 3

Chair/director and dean APR letters from years one and two.

QRF EPR 6

Chair/director and dean APR letters from years four and five. Chair/director, dean, and provost letters from first EPR.

Promotion to QRF Associate Professor

Chair/director and dean APR letters from years one, two, four, and five. Chair/director, dean, and provost letters from first EPR (and second EPR if applicable).

Promotion to QRF Professor

Chair/director, dean, and provost letters from promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.

TTF EPR

Chair/director and dean APR letters from years one and two.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Chair/director and dean APR letters from years one, two, four, and five. Chair/director, dean, and provost letters from TTF EPR.

Promotion to Professor

Chair/director, dean, and provost tenure letters.

Merit Documents – Department/School Forms

See separate guidance for merit process.

FIL Application Materials

See separate guidance for FIL process.

Allocation of Effort

See separate guidance for merit process.

“Profile” Area of Faculty 180

Personal Information

Check this information. If there are inaccuracies, contact the college faculty development team (Ted Rippey & Chris Bloomfield).

Contact Information

Check this information. If there are inaccuracies, contact the college faculty development team.

Current BGSU Rank and Title

Check this information. If there are inaccuracies, contact the college faculty development team.

Degrees

Check this information. If there are inaccuracies, contact the college faculty development team.

Memberships

Enter listings for current memberships in professional organizations.

Professional Licensures and Certifications

ONLY for official licensures and official professional certifications.

Honors

Awards, prizes, fellowships, membership in honorary societies, etc.

Work Experience

Listings and concise description of activities for 1) BGSU positions that differ from regular faculty positions and/or 2) professional positions held outside/prior to appointment at BGSU. Examples: BGSU appointments with substantial administrative duties, visiting appointments at other institutions, full-time professional positions in fields outside academe.

Interests

Not part of RTP dossier

Biography

Not part of RTP dossier

Appointment Letter

Original hire letter. NOT annual salary/annual reappointment letter.

Unit Merit and RPT Policies

Post applicable RTP policy document. See CBA #5, Article 14, Section 5.1 and subsections. If 2006 document was in place at beginning of promotion period and candidate wishes to be considered under the new, CBA-aligned policy, then candidate prepares a memo exercising option to be considered under new policy document. Language for candidate memo: 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]. Consult/work with Chair/Director and faculty development team as needed.