A&S Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Review

Process Workshops, 2016
Review basics: governing documents

• Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA): Article 14 (language on appointment, rank, review)

• Unit Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure document.
Review basics: process overview

- Solicitation and reception of external reviews (only for TTF tenure and promotion)
- Assembly of materials, uploading to electronic dossier (eRPT system). Chair “shall provide reasonable advanced notification” regarding deadlines (CBA Art. 14. sec. 6.1.1.1). See McFall deadlines, approved by Council of Deans.
- Dossier review and vote/recommendation by all eligible BUFMs; separate recommendations from eligible BUFMs and unit chair/director.
- College-level review and recommendations: PTRC, Dean.
- 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 (TTF EPR, NTTF EPR 1-3) or previous three academic years (NTTF 4+).
Eligible Voters

- Tenure & promotion to associate professor: all tenured faculty vote, two-thirds majority required. (CBA Art. 14, sections 6.6.5-6).
- 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. (14.6.7.3-4)
- TTF EPR: all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.6.2.4.2)
- NTTF promotion: NTTF of superior rank and all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.5.3.3.1.1)
- NTTF EPR: NTTF of superior rank, probationary TTF, and all tenured faculty vote, simple majority required. (14.5.2.4.3)
- Vote should precede drafting of unit-level faculty recommendation. Faculty recommendation memo should convey result of vote.
Key Dossier Contents

- Unit RPT document
- CV in BGSU format. For research & creative work, adhere carefully to the *documentation standards of your discipline*.
- Narratives and supporting materials: Teaching, Research/Creative Work (TTF only, as a general rule), Service
- External reviews (only for TTF tenure & promotion)
- Previous annual evaluation letters, reappointment letter (candidates for professor: use your tenure letter)
- *Recommendation* by unit faculty, including result of eligible BUFM vote (may be authored by designated committee)
- *Recommendation* by chair/director
eRPT Folders

- Unit P&T document
- Curriculum Vitae
- Teaching Narrative
- Peer Evaluations of Teaching (minimum 3)
- Quantitative Teaching Scores (since appt. or last promotion; include comparison & evaluation instrument)
- Qualitative Teaching Scores (student comments, comprehensive, since appt. or last promotion)
- Other Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (learning activities, awards, outcomes/assessment work, etc.)
- Service Narrative
- Relevant Supporting Service Materials
- Research Narrative
- External Review Letters & CVs
- Explanation of External Reviewer Selection Process
- Examples of Scholarly/Creative Work (all published work from review period)
- Annual Performance Evaluations
- Previous Reappointment Letters
- Unit RPT Committee Recommendation
- Unit Head Recommendation
- Appendix
- Rebuttals
- College RPT Committee Recommendation
- Dean Recommendation
- Provost Recommendation or Decision
FAQs

• Who exactly needs external reviews?
• What do candidates for full do about annual reviews and reappointment letters?
• Is my case governed by the 2006 policy?
• What are rebuttals?
• What are some good rules of thumb for CVs?
Teaching Materials

- Narrative (max 3 pages): philosophy, professional evolution, future goals
- Quantitative evaluation scores from all courses in the review period, presented in comparative context.
- Qualitative evaluation student comments from all courses in the review period.
- Three or more substantive peer reviews of teaching
- Further evidence of teaching and curricular contributions: examples of teaching innovation, curricular review/development, work on outcomes and assessment, teaching awards, significant professional development.
- Use the narrative to describe your trajectory and highlight signal accomplishments.
Sample narrative excerpts


(A&S web site, Faculty/Staff Resources page)
Student evaluation data

• Candidate and chair/director should work together to assemble evaluation set: all numerical scores and qualitative comments from the review period.

• Chair/director should present quantitative data in comparative context.

• 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 sheet/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</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100E</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.91</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>(17)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(6.04)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(6.45)</td>
<td>(6.17)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(6.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #16: Overall Rating of Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor Mean</th>
<th>Cohort Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>PHYS 3600</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 1010</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 4000</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 1940Q</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ENVS 1940Q</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>PHYS 3600</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ENVS 4020</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
- Cohort mean divided into two groups: 1000 level and 3000/4000 level.
- 5 = Excellent, 1 = Poor

Legend:
Blue = instructor
Red = cohort
Peer reviews of teaching

• Should be a substantive evaluation, not a description of activities.

• Who is an appropriate peer? Ideally, a colleague of superior rank and experience, but not a supervisor. If your unit pool is limited, consider colleagues from related disciplines.

• Suggest a pre-classroom visit with instructor; discuss syllabus and pedagogical approach.

• Review should address how the material is taught as well as what is being taught.
Research/Creative Materials

• Narrative (3 pages): Describe your scholarly/creative agenda & trajectory, highlight signal achievements.
• All publications from review period
• Evidence of external funding activity
• External reviews and reviewer CVs (chair/director organizes)
• Full professor cases: assessment of quantity should focus on record since tenure, evaluation of quality should consider entire body of work.
• NTTF appointments typically do not entail research/creative duties.
Research/Creative Work Narrative

• Describe and contextualize your work in language that is accessible to readers outside your field.
• Provide a sense of scholarly/creative trajectory. Tenure candidates are expected to demonstrate an independent program of scholarship/creative work.
• Provide evidence that your work is valued in the discipline.
• Tenure candidates “shall have demonstrated ability to do scholarly work, as indicated by publications...” (14.3.1.2.3); candidates for professor “shall have an established reputation within the discipline...” (14.3.1.3.3).
External Reviews
Only for tenure, promotion to associate & promotion to professor

- Gather input from candidate, faculty, chair. Initial list should be free of conflicts of interest. Keep “arm’s length” in mind.
- Generate an initial list of 15-20. Start early. We are looking for peer or aspirant institutions and programs. There should be a solid rationale for a reviewer from an institution or program that does not fit that description.
- Candidate should be allowed up to three vetoes with no questions asked.
- NO DIRECT CONTACT between candidates and prospective reviewers.
- See A&S informational PDFs for sample solicitation letters
Service Materials

Service Narrative (1-2 single-spaced 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 profession (professional society or organization).
• Indicate some service goals for the future.

Include relevant supporting materials (e.g., letters of acknowledgment or other documentation)

Service expectation is greater for promotion to senior lecturer or full professor. Service leadership can provide a good distinction.
Questions / more info

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

A&S web site, Faculty/Staff page
http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/faculty.html