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## Schedule for Faculty Reviews 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Candidates Submit Credentials to Departments*</th>
<th>Department Committee Decision Due to Chair</th>
<th>Chair Recommendations Due to the College Office</th>
<th>College PTRC Recommendations due to the Dean</th>
<th>Dean’s Recommendations due to the Provost</th>
<th>Provost’s Recommendations finalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TTF Promotion and Tenure (eRPT)</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>Late March/ early April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF Promotion (eRPT)</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>Late March/ early April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF EPRs (eRPT)</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>November 30</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>Late April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF EPRs Years 3 (eRPT)</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>By April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF EPRs Years 6 (eRPT)</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>By February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF EPRs Years 7+ (eRPT)</td>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>By December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF APRs Years 1-2 (paper)</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF APRs Years 4-5 (paper)</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF APRs Years 1-3 (paper)</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>By April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF APRs Years 4-6 (paper)</td>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>By February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTF APRs Years 7+ (paper)</td>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>By December 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- The dates for submission of credentials to departments are suggested dates, candidates should check with their academic units for official deadlines.
- Rebuttal letters may be submitted within two business days from notification of the recommendation at each step of the process through the Dean’s recommendation.
- Not all units’ review policies require unit committee recommendations for APRs. Candidates should check their units’ annual review policies for clarification.
- For annual review of faculty in Year 1, the materials submitted for consideration are usually limited to the first fall semester. In subsequent years, review materials include spring, summer (where applicable), and fall materials.
Overview of Promotion Review Process

April, 2014

• Workshops on promotion

April through September, 2014

• Candidates prepare electronic dossier with assistance from a chair, a senior faculty member and members of the department promotion committee.
  - **Note:** It is the candidate’s responsibility to assemble all materials and ensure accuracy of materials submitted. It is NOT the responsibility of the chair or secretary.

September-October, 2014

• Tenured faculty review dossiers and vote on promotion

• Department promotion committee prepares recommendation letter

• Chair prepares recommendation letter

October 31, 2014

• Chair’s recommendation due to College.
November-December, 2014

College Review of Dossiers

- A&S office staff reviews materials submitted for incomplete or extraneous information. Candidates may be asked to add or remove materials

- Associate Dean Ted Rippey reviews all materials for substantive inclusions.
  - Candidate/chair/director/committee may be asked for modifications or expansions.

- College PTRC Reviews materials

- PTRC makes recommendations to Dean by 15 December

- Dean makes recommendation to Provost

College PTRC Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Longmore</td>
<td>Social Sciences Division</td>
<td>2014-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Layden (Chair)</td>
<td>Math/Science Division</td>
<td>2013-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie Terry-Fritsch (Chair Elect)</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities Division</td>
<td>2014-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Robinson</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities Division (AL)</td>
<td>2013-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 31, 2015

- Dean’s recommendation posted, Provost-level review begins

- Copy of Dean’s letter distributed to candidates and chairs/directors

Spring, 2015

- Notification of Provost’s recommendation
Relevant Portions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

The below are excerpts, the entire CBA can be found at this link:
http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/documents/policies-guidelines/agreement-faculty-association.pdf

ARTICLE 14
REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

3. Academic Rank. Bargaining Unit Faculty Members shall hold one of the following ranks. There shall not be any other ranks created for Bargaining Unit Faculty. The criteria for ranks apply both to initial hiring and for subsequent evaluation for promotion.

3.1. Academic Ranks for Tenure-Track Faculty

3.1.1. Assistant Professor. Consistent with the discipline, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member with the rank of Assistant Professor:
3.1.1.1. Shall either hold an appropriate doctoral degree, or the appropriate terminal degree (in those fields where the doctorate is not the normal terminal degree) from an accredited college or university, or (if recommended by two-thirds of the faculty of the academic unit, and with concurrence of the Dean and Provost/VPAA), appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor in academic fields may be made to candidates who hold a master’s degree provided that the faculty member completes, within one year of initial appointment date, the degree specified as required in the appointment letter. Failure to complete the required terminal degree within one year of initial appointment shall be grounds for termination after one additional year of service during which the faculty member may not be further considered for tenure;
3.1.1.2. Shall have evident ability as a teacher;
3.1.1.3. Shall give evidence of ability to do scholarly or creative work; and
3.1.1.4. Shall give evidence of the potential to make contributions to the University, community, and/or profession.

3.1.2. Associate Professor. Consistent with the discipline, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member with the rank of Associate Professor:
3.1.2.1. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent (see 3.1.1.1) from an accredited college or university;
3.1.2.2. Shall demonstrate ability as an effective teacher;
3.1.2.3. Shall have demonstrated ability to do scholarly or creative work as indicated by publications, significant research, or presentation of refereed papers at regional or national meetings, or their equivalent in the creative or performing arts; and
3.1.2.4. If currently employed at BGSU, shall give evidence of active involvement in service to the University, community, and/or profession. If initially hired at this rank, shall give evidence of potential contributions to the University, community, and/or profession.

3.1.3. Professor. Consistent with the discipline, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member with the rank of Professor:
3.1.3.1. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent (see 3.1.1.1) from an accredited college or university;
3.1.3.2. Shall have an established reputation as an effective teacher;
3.1.3.3. Shall have an established reputation within the discipline or profession as evidenced by a record of productive scholarship, significant research, or the equivalent in the creative or performing arts; and
3.1.3.4. If currently employed at BGSU, shall give evidence of significant service to the University, community, and/or profession. If initially hired at this rank, shall give evidence of potential contributions to the University, community, and/or profession.

6.3. Standards for Tenure

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.

6.3.2. 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
individual academic units (Section 6.5.1). All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA.

6.4. Standards for Promotion

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/Director to submit credentials for promotion review.

6.4.2. The criteria for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are set forth in 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 individual academic units (Section 6.5.1). All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA.

6.5. Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Recommendations

6.5.1. Each academic unit (department, school, or instructional support unit) 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.

6.5.2. 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/Director.

6.5.3. The Chair/Director 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/Director differs from
that of the academic unit’s tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, this recommendation of the Chair/Director shall state the reasons for the difference.

6.5.4. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Chair/Director, 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/Director, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA.

6.5.5. 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.

6.5.6. 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/Director, 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.

6.6. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

6.6.1. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section 6.5.

6.6.2. 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.

6.6.3. 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.

6.6.4. 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.

6.6.5. 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/Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.

6.6.6. 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.

6.6.7. 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.

6.6.8. 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.

6.7. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor

6.7.1. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section 6.5.

6.7.2. A tenure-track or tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who presents him/herself for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit pursuant to Section 6.7.3.

6.7.3. 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/Director. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.

6.7.4. 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.

7. Evaluation for Faculty with Joint or Dual Affiliation

7.1. For faculty whose appointment has joint affiliation (section 1.3) or dual affiliation (section 1.3), there should be a written agreement stating such affiliation, signed by the Provost/VPAA, regarding which academic unit criteria shall be applied in making decisions regarding evaluations for reappointment, merit salary raises, tenure (if applicable) or promotion.

7.2. For faculty whose appointment has joint affiliations, it shall be customary that
the evaluation criteria used shall be based on the policies of the academic unit that holds the rank and salary line of the faculty member. Exceptions to this provision must be in writing and signed by the Provost/VPAA.

7.2.1. In order to enhance the evaluation base, the Dean shall appoint faculty qualified to vote; who are representative of the other academic units in which the faculty member fulfills annual assignments of teaching, research, or service; in a proportionality matching the faculty member’s assignment to these other unit(s); to participate in the unit evaluation process.

7.2.2. Academic units may authorize faculty personnel committees to fulfill a portion of the evaluation process, in which case for faculty on joint appointments there shall be committee membership representative of the faculty member’s annual teaching, research, or service assignment to the several academic units.

7.2.3. In the absence of a written agreement at the time of hire between tenure track or tenured faculty members and the Provost/VPAA establishing alternate criteria and process for the evaluation of reappointment, tenure and promotion, faculty members holding a joint appointment will follow standards for tenure and standards for promotion established by the academic unit in which they were appointed upon hire.

7.3. For faculty whose appointment has dual affiliation, it shall be customary for the various academic units to stipulate in writing which unit criteria, or combinations of criteria, shall be used for evaluations for reappointment, merit, tenure, and promotion. Such stipulations must be in writing and signed by the Provost/VPAA.

7.3.1. Academic units may authorize faculty personnel committees to fulfill a portion of the evaluation process, in which case for faculty on dual appointments there shall be committee membership representative of the faculty member’s annual teaching, research, or service assignments in each unit.

7.3.2. In the absence of a written agreement at the time of hire between tenure track or tenured faculty members and the Provost/VPAA establishing alternate criteria and process for the evaluation of reappointment, tenure and promotion, faculty members holding dual affiliation will follow written standards for promotion and standards for tenure of the academic unit stated in the initial letter of appointment.

7.4. Faculty whose appointments have joint or dual affiliations have the right and
privilege to seek redress through the grievance and arbitration process (Article 13) if the reappointment, merit, tenure, or promotion policies of the affiliated units are not clearly or fairly applied.

8. Grievances Related to This Article

8.1. The procedures set forth in this Article shall govern grievances, including any arbitration, related to denial of tenure, denial of promotion, or non-renewal of appointment of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members.

8.2. In grievances related to denial of tenure, denial of promotion of tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty, or nonrenewal of appointment for tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty, the arbitrator shall consider all procedural errors or claims that the decisions made were arbitrary and capricious and determine if, in their totality, they constitute substantive prejudice to the candidate.

8.3. The arbitrator’s authority to form an award shall be confined to (1) identifying the error; and (2) remanding the matter back to the University for further consideration from the point in the process where the identified error occurred. The arbitrator shall remand the tenure, promotion, or non-renewal decision being grieved to the point of initial error with directions as to which of the existing procedures in the Agreement or in applicable college, school, or department bylaws are to be followed.

8.4. The arbitrator does not have the authority to award tenure, promotion, or renewal of appointment to a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member.

8.5. At each level where a tenure or promotion case is remanded and/or subsequently reviewed, individuals and committees shall consider, on an expedited basis, any advice and recommendations made by the arbitrator.
REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL CV/RESUMÉ FORM FOR BGSU FACULTY
Excerpted from University Charter, Faculty Handbook Section

(In all categories, please respond chronologically with the most recent activity at the top of the list.)

I. Academic Degrees

II. Academic Positions
   A. Teaching Positions
   B. Administrative Positions

III. Non-academic Positions
   (List all salaried positions in business, industry, or government. Do not list minor political offices or appointments.)

IV. Teaching Experiences
   A. Teaching Experiences
      (List the course you have taught and the number of years of experience with each course. Do not list “Problems” or “Readings” courses.)
      1. Undergraduate Courses
      2. Undergraduate-Graduate Courses
      3. Graduate Courses
      4. Other Teaching. (List here interdisciplinary courses, supervision of students, teachers, workshops, or courses conducted to teach graduate assistants to teach or other kinds of teaching unique to a college or university setting.)
      5. Thesis and Dissertation Students. (List here those students for whom you served as the major research advisor and as chair of the thesis or examining committee.)
         a. Theses: Name Degree Year University
         b. Dissertations: Name Degree Year University
      6. Membership on Dissertation Committees: Name Degree Year University
      7. Membership on Thesis Committees: Name Degree Year University

V. Curriculum Development
   (List courses added to the curriculum, workshops, etc.)
   A. Courses
   B. Workshops
   C. Educational Materials (filmstrips, films, TV materials, etc. Provide publisher, date of publication, etc.)

VI. Professional Development
   (List courses taken, workshops, improvement leaves, post-doctoral training, etc.)

VII. Academic Advising
   A. Undergraduate Year Number of Students Assigned
   B. Graduate Year Number of Students Assigned
VIII. Research Interests
(Give the specialty or specialties within your discipline in which you have high research competence(ies) and with which you prefer to be identified.)

IX. Research Projects and Grants
(List the funding agency, the agency project number if known, the date, the dollar amount of support, and the title of the project. Do not list pending or unsuccessful applications. Any special research equipment or travel grants should be included under this heading.)

X. Publications and Equivalencies
A. Publications
List only articles published or accepted for publication and/or books published or assigned a publication date. In all cases include publisher, date of publication, pages and other appropriate information.

1. Books
   (a) Textbooks
   (b) Scholarly books
   (c) Anthologies and all edited texts designated as such
   (d) Indexes and other bibliographic texts

2. Journal Articles
   (a) Refereed Articles
      (1) Journals
      (2) Proceedings
   (b) Non-refereed Articles
      (1) Journals
      (2) Newsletters
      (3) Miscellaneous
      (4) Editorships of Journals

3. Book Reviews
   (a) Book review essays
   (b) Book reviews

4. Abstracts

5. Reports
   (a) Published
   (b) Unpublished

OR

B. Equivalencies
Spatial Arts
(List appropriate information, dates, locations, etc.)

1. Invited BGSU art shows
2. Invited external art shows
3. Juried exhibitions
4. Works in permanent collections
5. Touring exhibits
6. One-person shows
7. Prizes

OR
What to Include in Your Dossier

Professional CV

Dramatic Arts
1. Directing (Play, where performed, dates, sponsor/producer)
2. Acting (Play, where performed, dates, sponsor/producer)
3. Original play (Name, publisher or producer, dates, location, etc.)
4. Scenery and costume design (Play, where performed, dates, sponsor/producer)

OR

Patents Awarded
(List patent number, date, etc.)
OR
Product or Engineering Designs
(Describe product, company accepting design, etc.)
OR

Other

XI. Papers Read to Professional Societies
A. Invited papers
B. Refereed papers
C. Non-refereed papers

XII. Service
A. Department
B. College
C. University
D. Professional
(List only offices or other held appropriate professional service such as chairing a symposium or panel discussion.)

XIII. Research or Professional Consultantships

XIV. Membership in Professional Organizations

XV. Honors and Awards
A. Membership in Honor Societies
B. Awards (List award, date, sponsor, etc.)
The Teaching Portfolio

Recommendations for Inclusion*
• Narrative statement describing candidate philosophy and evidence of accomplishments. Should be no more than three single-spaced pages.
• Quantitative teaching evaluations for all classes taught since last promotion/hire.
• Complete sets of qualitative student comments from three to four courses.
• At least three substantive peer reviews of classroom teaching since last promotion/hire.
• Three supplemental examples of successful teaching.
*Faculty should consult their unit Promotion Document for portfolio requirements

Thoughts on narrative:
• include personal teaching philosophy including goals and objectives
• reflect on successes and those strategies that fell short of success
• describe steps taken to improve teaching
• include materials you use to supplement and augment your teaching efforts
• include delineation of learning outcomes and assessment techniques and their results
• strike a balance between personal and professional tone
• identify the unique instructional contributions that the candidate makes

Narrative should also:
• highlight the details of the teaching portfolio outlining all the materials that were included and why they were included
• include teaching strategies and goals for the next five years
• distinguish between graduate and undergraduate instruction as appropriate
• show how you have designed and constructed your contributions to the curriculum
• emphasize the scholarship of teaching
• refer to syllabi that are included

Primary indicators to include:
• quantitative student evaluations from all classes and how these contrast with others in the department
• complete sets of qualitative student evaluations from three to four classes
• peer reviews—a minimum of three since last promotion/hire

Secondary indicators, at least three required, may include:
• products of your teaching (projects, labs, exhibitions, student writing, exams)- include your assignment or activity design and a representative example of student work
• presentations and publications on teaching
• reviews by colleagues of student assignments, syllabi, tests, projects
• unsolicited letters from students
The Research/Creative Work Portfolio
Tenure and Promotion

Recommendations for Inclusion*

- Narrative statement, no more than three single spaced pages, that describes the candidate’s philosophy and provides a discussion of recent accomplishments. The narrative should unfold the evolution of the candidate’s research program. Document collaborations and indicate names of colleagues. Emphasize BGSU collaborations. Identify future directions.
- External reviews of research. A minimum of three evaluations required.
- At least three and no more than five samples of publications or scholarly/creative work.
*Faculty should consult their unit promotion document for portfolio requirements

Thoughts on Narrative:

- Include past, present and future research/creative work directions and accomplishments
- Provide an overview of the supporting materials that are included and why they were selected
- Address the independent evolution of research/creative work since graduate school
- Strike a balance between personal and professional tone
- Emphasize how (graduate) students are involved in your research program
- Avoid highly technical discussion and design discussion; write for the layperson
- Include evidence that work is highly valued

Supplemental Materials to Document Research Accomplishments

- Evidence of grant writing activity including dollars secured (include non-funded as well). DO NOT include full grant proposals. You may include abstract and notification of award
- Presentations at professional meetings, public presentations. (Do not include presentations to colleague’s classrooms)
- Citation indexes
- Reviews in professional and public media
- Slides of creative work with an index
- Programs, announcements of creative work

The research portfolio is designed to selective and representative but not necessarily all inclusive. The vita should be inclusive.
Guidelines for Soliciting External Letters of Review for Promotion and Tenure*

- Request suggestions of reviewers experienced in the candidate’s discipline and/or area of expertise from all tenured faculty members in the academic unit. Depending on policies of the academic unit, the candidate may be asked to contribute names of potential reviewers with whom he or she has no personal or professional ties that could compromise the review.
- Compile a list of suggested reviewers sufficient in number to assure adequate and timely response. The list may be long with as many as 20 or so names if necessary. A minimum of three external reviews will be included in the credential file.
- Ask candidate to review the list from the faculty and identify individuals who pose a conflict of interest (mentors, co-authors, co-workers, friends, relatives--anyone he or she has worked with closely) and remove them from the list.
- Allow candidate two or three vetoes with no reasons or explanations required.
- Phone potential reviewers, when time is limited, to request participation in the assessment of the candidate's credentials. The conversation should follow a standardized script to model neutrality. Follow up the call with a confirmation letter clarifying the intent of the assessment. Phone calls are not substitutes for reviews, which must be submitted to the academic unit in writing.
- Write a standard letter to prospective reviewers asking for their assistance in measuring the candidate's abilities and professional impact in the form of an external review. The letter should clarify that the intent of the review is to obtain an objective, in-depth assessment of candidate credentials, and not merely a letter of recommendation, which is likely to be of a more personal and general nature.
- Explain to the reviewer that the substance of the review (not necessarily in this order) should focus on:
  - quality and quantity of the scholarly work and relative importance of each in the reviewer’s assessment;
  - comparison of accomplishments in relation to those of other scholars in the discipline;
  - impact of the work on the discipline;
  - candid, objective evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly strengths and weaknesses; and
  - explanation of how the reviewer knows the candidate, if applicable, without making personal assessments, either positive or negative.
- Do not ask reviewers to include a recommendation on the tenurability of the candidate.
- Request that reviewers submit a copy of their vitae to assist the tenured faculty understand their academic expertise and background.
- Include a statement regarding Ohio’s Public Records Act in the letters to potential reviewers. The Office of General Counsel suggests: “Letters of evaluation are not confidential and may be disclosed under the Ohio Public Records Act.” This law, however, does not preclude objective, professional assessment of scholarly accomplishments when personal reference and innuendo are excluded.
- Consult with the tenured faculty regarding the materials sent to reviewers. These may include vitae, a sample of articles, and statement on research. The department and college's promotion and tenure documents should be included to assist the external reviewer understand the parameters of the overall evaluation. Keep the review package tight and manageable.
- Encourage timely return of written external letters for the academic unit's assessment of candidate credentials and prior to the unit vote. Reviews do NOT have to be in by department deadline for the candidate's submission of credentials.
- Remind candidates to exclude themselves completely from the external review process outside of providing names of potential reviewers and suggesting materials for inclusion in the review package when requested by the academic unit.

* Guidelines presented here are offered as suggestions only and are not binding. The Collective Bargaining Agreement and approved promotion and tenure documents adopted by the colleges and/or their academic units take precedence over these procedures in application.

Office of the Provost/VPAA: 08/14/13
TO: Simon Morgan-Russell, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: xxxxx, Chair, xxlogy

DATE: September 30, 2011

RE: External reviewers for Professor xxx

Pursuant to Professor xxx’s application for promotion and tenure, I solicited names of potential external reviewers from Professor xx and from colleagues in the department in his speciality areas of xxx and xxx. We concentrated on these scholars because they are in the areas with which Professor xxx primarily identifies, and in which he has done most of his research. We identified eight individuals, three from Professor xxx’s list and five from others in the department. Of these eight, five agreed to provide reviews of Professor xxx’s published research. One of these reviewers was suggested by Professor xxx, and four by his colleagues in the department.

Professor xxx is a senior associate professor in the Department of xxx at the Ohio State University, and the associate director of the Center for Human Resource Research. She received her Ph.D. from Brown University. She is a xxx with a particular focus on adolescence. She has received multiple grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development as well as other agencies to support her research, and has published over 30 articles in leading journals.

Professor xxx received his Ph.D. from SUNY-Albany, and is the Howard W. Odum Distinguished Professor of xxx at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is a xxx who specializes in x. He has earned many research grants from the National Institutes of Health, and has over three dozen publications in excellent journals including the xxx Review and the American Journal of xxx, the two top journals in the discipline.

Professor xxx is a senior associate professor in the Department of xxx at the University of Minnesota, where he has served as both director of the Life Course Center and director of graduate studies. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Toronto. He is a xxx and xxx with research specializations in both xxx and xxx. His research has been funded by the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and others. He has authored many journal articles and book chapters, has co-authored one book, and was the editor of two volumes in the prestigious xxx series published by Elsevier.

Professor xxx is professor of xx at the University of Texas at Austin. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin. She is a xxx and xxx with specializations in xxx and xxx. She has earned many research grants from the National Institute of Child Health and
Human Development and the National Science Foundation. She has published frequently in the best journals in the discipline, including the xxx Review, xx, and xxx.

Professor xxx is a Distinguished Research Professor in the Department of xxx at the University of Georgia. He received his Ph.D. from Florida State University. He specializes in xxx and xxx, and much of his work focuses on xxx. He has earned millions of dollars in research grants from a variety of federal agencies, particularly the National Institute of Mental Health. He has over 100 publications, many of which are located in highly prestigious journals.

Collectively, these reviewers are very accomplished scholars. Their areas of expertise overlap well with Professor xxx’s, so they are appropriate judges of the quantity and quality of his published work.
Dear Professor:

Thank you very much for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for Professor xxx’s case for promotion and tenure to associate professor. We very much appreciate the time and effort you are contributing to our evaluation. I should note at the outset that Professor xx was hired in 200x as an untenured assistant professor, so both tenure and promotion are at issue here.

Enclosed please find: (1) Professor xxx’s curriculum vitae; (2) her brief summary of her research agenda and objectives; (3) copies of five of her published articles; and (4) copies of our university and departmental documents pertaining to tenure.

We ask that you review Professor xxx’s record of research and publication. Our concerns involve the quantity, quality, and impact of her work. We are interested in your impressions of Professor xxx’s accomplishments relative to her peers, whether she is pursuing enduring and important issues in her research agenda, the level of scholarship embodied in her articles, the skills she brings to her research endeavors, and the impact of her work in the context of the discipline as a whole. More specifically, how does her work compare with that of her peers working in the area? Would you please also explain briefly if and how you are acquainted with Professor xxx? Finally, to assist the tenured faculty understand your academic expertise and background, would you please enclose a copy of your curriculum vitae when submitting your evaluation?

Please note that we are only asking you to submit an objective letter of evaluation regarding Professor xxx’s research. Promotion and tenure at Bowling Green State University depends on one’s record of teaching and service in addition to research. However, these matters are evaluated internally. We ask your assistance only with respect to her research record. Please also note that we are not asking you whether or not you would promote Professor X as you are not being asked to evaluate her complete dossier.

I should also tell you that the Ohio Public Records Act does not permit confidentiality in the review process. By law, evaluations are public records and may be viewed by anyone, including the candidate.

We would greatly appreciate receiving your signed original response by September 1st, 2011, in order to conform to our university’s time line. Thank you again for agreeing to help us in this most important matter.

Sincerely,
Jane Doe
Professor and Chair
The Service Portfolio

Tenure and promotion to associate usually requires demonstration of some service at the
departmental, college, and University level. It is also important to demonstrate that the
candidate is a functional “team player” and contributes to the unit. Candidates for promotion
to full professor are expected to have made significant service contributions at the
departmental, college, University, and professional levels.

Recommendations for Inclusion*

• Narrative statement, no more than three single spaced pages, that describes the
candidate’s philosophy and evidence of recent accomplishments.

• Relevant supporting materials
* Faculty should consult their unit promotion document for portfolio requirements.

Thoughts:

• You might like to emphasize several departmental service activities in which you were
involved and demonstrate that you made substantive contributions. If you have served
as advisor to a student group, include this information here.

• Delineate several college and/or University committees. Emphasize any leadership roles
you assumed.

• Include any service to a professional society or organization

• Include any service to the community at large.

• Include statements or letters from colleagues that extol your service contributions. (As a
rule of thumb, up to three to four letters recapping significant leadership or
commitment is sufficient. Unsolicited letters are often included and have no limit.)

• Your narrative may indicate some service goals for the future.