


November 7, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Onasch  
Geology

FROM: John W. Folkins   
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Updates to Promotion and Tenure Document

Your recent revision to your unit's promotion and tenure document has been reviewed and approved at all levels. This represents a significant step forward for the University, as it creates an unambiguous standard for the recognition of engaged activities. Although all agree that engagement with community partners is not necessary for successful fulfillment of faculty duties in teaching, research, and service, the revision of the promotion and tenure documents opens the door to allow, recognize, and encourage faculty to engage with community partners in all their scholarly undertakings.

C: D. Nieman  
D. Madigan

## ***Departmental Tenure and Promotion Policy***

(Approved April 19, 2006)

Preamble: The purposes of this document are:

- a) to guide and assist faculty and their academic units in the development of merit, contract renewal, promotion and tenure policies;
- b) to promote, protect, and ensure that the policies and processes so delineated reflect the autonomy and unique characteristics of the academic units;
- c) to assure that faculty personnel processes are reflective of the current BGSU vision statement;
- d) to assure that internal faculty peer review and judgment which lie at the core of our values are maintained in reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit decisions;
- e) to ensure that all faculty experience fair, equitable and consistent processes in the evaluations that take place at their career mileposts, and
- f) to ensure that the relevant sections of the Academic Charter are followed.

### **DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, MERIT, CONTRACT RENEWAL, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF TENURED AND PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

Department of Geology  
College of Arts & Sciences  
Bowling Green State University

#### **I. Department Policy**

The Department of Geology explains by means of this policy statement the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the annual evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty for salary changes (merit), promotion, tenure, and contract renewal. This statement complies with the policies of the Board of Trustees of Bowling Green State University, the Academic Charter, and the College of Arts & Sciences. This statement is provided to all faculty in the department upon request or annually and a copy is maintained in the department office. It has been approved by the faculty of the department in accord with department policies.

#### **A. Vision Statement**

The department recognizes that in matters relating to annual review, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure of faculty, Bowling Green State University supports performance consistent with the University's aspiration to be the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation. As defined by the Academic Charter (Article II.A, Section A), "The persons who create and maintain the University constitute the University Community. There are five groups within this Community: students, faculty, administrators, administrative staff and classified staff." To achieve its objectives, the University expects faculty participation in the interdependent areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service that is of the highest quality, grounded in intellectual discovery, and guided by rational discourse and civility. The essence of this department's evaluation process is to improve faculty members' performance through appropriate evaluation and timely feedback. Careful and consistent application of the criteria and standards in evaluating faculty performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service are of fundamental importance in achieving the department's mission and in protecting the rights of the individual faculty member. Department review processes are to be conducted clearly, openly, responsibly, and fairly.

## B. The Academic Charter

The University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure (Section B-I.C) and the statement on Evaluation of Faculty Personnel (Section B-I.D), as contained in the Academic Charter, identify the three relevant evaluation criteria as teaching, research/creative work, and service and define the basic requirements for merit, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. As stated in the Academic Charter (Section B-I.D.2.a), for promotion policies "Academic units may develop more specific or more rigorous criteria in teaching, service, or scholarly activity, provided that such criteria are equitable and appropriate and provided that they do not conflict with the criteria below and, in a department/school, with the criteria of the majority of the faculty members of the academic unit." As stated in the Academic Charter for tenure policies, Section B-I.D.2 b, "Either academic units or colleges may develop more precise statements of what is expected under each criterion, but may not add other criteria." All such statements shall be approved by the appropriate academic unit or college tenured faculties . . ." These criteria and standards allow for differentiation among faculty members with regard to their roles and contributions within the department in fulfillment of the, department, college and University mission.

### 1. Faculty Appointments

The University Charter (B-I.C.2) defines two types of faculty appointments (tenure track and non-tenure track) and distinguishes between two types of tenure track appointment (probationary and tenured). Non-tenure track appointments are discussed in Section B-I.C.2.a of the Academic Charter, which includes statements on the probationary period, review process, and termination. Tenured appointments and the policies associated with such appointments are described in Section B-I.C.2.b of the Academic Charter, which includes statements on the meaning, obligations, and termination of tenure.

### 2. Annual Review for Reappointment

The Academic Charter mandates a comprehensive annual review of all non-tenure track continuing faculty members in Section B-I.D.4 (Instructor) or Section B-I.D.5 (Lecturer), and of probationary tenure track faculty members in B-I.D.2.b. For probationary faculty members, the overriding question to be considered by the department and the dean during the annual review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Probationary faculty members who are awarded two or three-year contracts shall be reviewed during the last year of the contract to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and whether the contract shall be renewed.

### 3. Review for Tenure

The department has the primary responsibility for evaluating probationary faculty for tenure. In addition to annual reviews, the Academic Charter at B-I D.2.b.(2) mandates that a probationary faculty member be evaluated no later than the next-to-last year of the probationary appointment. Probationary faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the probationary period. Because department and college review committees apply tenure standards without discounted expectations based on a shorter probationary period, faculty members are discouraged from seeking early tenure decisions unless there are compelling reasons for doing so.

### 4. Review for Promotion

The department also has the primary responsibility for the comprehensive review of all faculty members nominated for promotion. The qualifications for assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are described in B-I.D.2.a.(1).(b), (c), and (d) of the

Academic Charter. The department may stipulate criteria and standards for promotion that differentiate among the ranks with regard to their expected contributions to the department's performance as long as those criteria and standards do not conflict with the provisions of the Academic Charter and of the College. The department stipulates the following criteria as standards for promotion that differentiate among the ranks with regard to their expected contributions to the department's performance.

a. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

1. There should be evidence for the continuing updating and improvement of course content, as well as supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate research.
2. Research accomplishment must be evident in the completion of research projects different from the doctoral dissertation and in the publication of the results in refereed journals. Outside funding would add to the evidence that the candidate's research is significant.
3. Continuing professional development should be demonstrated by at least some combination of membership in professional societies, contributions to professional meetings or conferences, attendance at professional meetings, and participation in professional workshops or short courses.
4. Service to department, college, university, community, and/or profession is essential and is a factor in promotion.

b. Promotion to Professor

1. Teaching performance must include excellence and innovation in both lower level and advanced courses. Supervision of student research should be common.
2. Research excellence is emphasized. Publication of numerous articles in refereed journals should result from this research. A significant level of funding for the research is one indicator of its significance. The candidate should be recognized as a prominent researcher in his/her field by peers.
3. Continuing professional development should be evident. Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, workshops, and/or short courses should demonstrate continued learning.
4. Continuing service commitment to department, college, university, community, and/or profession should be evident.

5. Review for Merit

Finally, the department has the primary responsibility for making all recommendations of salary changes (merit) for faculty (Section B-I.D.1 of the Academic Charter). Although the Academic Charter does not require that this be done annually, University practice has been to encourage such reviews on an annual basis to provide feedback on performance to the faculty member regardless of whether or not a merit salary allocation is made in a particular year.

II. Allocation of Effort

Each faculty member needs to allocate time and effort to a wide range of teaching, research/creative, and service obligations that promote the mission and goals of the University, college, and department. All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how departmental expectations, evaluative criteria,

#### A. Undergraduate Teaching

The department considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member's effort and record of achievement. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching could include:

1. Written comments that evaluate the candidate's teaching competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and presentation of material, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative teaching methods, integration of new developments into course curricula, and preparation of examinations that adequately test the student's knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. These comments may come from peers, students, or others.
2. Written peer evaluations of the candidate's supervision of student research projects (including theses), and other outside indicators that document the quality of collaborative research with a student (which might include the presentation of results at a scientific meeting, publication of results in a scientific journal, and best paper/presentation awards for the student).
3. Student standardized teaching evaluations, when used in conjunction with other indicators.
4. Verbatim comments from a random selection of student evaluations, when used in conjunction with other indicators.
5. Evidence for contributions to student success beyond their degree, such as mentoring, career guidance, employment placement, and alumni outreach.
6. Teaching awards or other distinctions based upon teaching.

#### B. Graduate Teaching

The department offers a Masters of Science degree in Geology, and therefore expects that all faculty will contribute to the learning of graduate students. Based upon the expertise of individual faculty and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, faculty should provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars and make appropriate contributions to the recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students. In addition, faculty with appropriate areas of expertise are expected to participate in the direction of theses and/or dissertations and to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of graduate teaching could include:

1. Written comments that evaluate the candidate's teaching competence, knowledge of subject matter, organization and presentation of material, ability to stimulate intellectual curiosity, innovative teaching methods, integration of new developments into course curricula, and preparation of examinations that adequately test the student's knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. These comments may come from peers, students, or others.
2. Written peer evaluations of the candidate's supervision of student research projects (including theses), and other outside indicators that document the quality of collaborative research with a student (which might include the presentation of results at a scientific meeting, publication of results in a scientific journal, and best paper/presentation awards for the student).
3. Student standardized teaching evaluations, when used in conjunction with other indicators.
4. Verbatim comments from a random selection of student evaluations, when used in conjunction with other indicators.
5. Evidence for success of directed graduate students, mentoring, career guidance, employment placement, and alumni outreach.
6. Record of extramural support secured for graduate students.
7. Teaching awards or other distinctions based upon teaching

### C. Instructional Development

Departmental faculty are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum of the department as a whole and to improve their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instructional development could include:

1. Revision of existing courses and (if appropriate) introduction of new courses, as indicated by course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught.
2. Teaching of independent study classes.
3. Evidence for professional development for the purpose of improved teaching, such as conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, new skills acquired, or other evidence.
4. Evidence for innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.
5. Evidence of contributions to departmental efforts for curriculum review, modification, revision or development.
6. Evidence of contributions to programmatic review and assessment. For the purposes of promotion and tenure no fewer than three of the performance indicators will be used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching effectiveness.

### D. Additional Contributions to Student Learning

Faculty members also make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate such contributions could include:

1. Academic advising services for students
2. Guidance of students in internships with industry, or government agencies that are related to the student's geological education
3. Involvement in outside-the-classroom activities, such as geological field trips, taking students to conferences or meetings, or other activities that promote faculty-student interactions
4. Involvement in student organizations that promote faculty-student interactions
5. Participation in University, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
6. Contribution to departmental efforts for the recruiting and retention of students.
7. Direction of independent research by students.
8. Integration of service learning activities into classes.
9. Inclusion of students in community engagement projects.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of teaching is this: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standards for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described in the University's governance documents and supportive of the instructional mission of the department, college, and University?

## IV. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base of geology is a central responsibility of all faculty members in the department. Such contributions are important in their own right and they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members

should maintain a record of their research/creative work that addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation. Individual performance indicators are listed under the separate domains of publications and presentations, extramural support, institutional outreach, and reputation within the discipline.

#### A. Publications/Presentations/Performances

Faculty members should demonstrate the ability to formulate a directed research program with well-defined goals through single or multi-authored publications and presentations. In the case of multi-authored publications, presentations, or collaborative work, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to clearly indicate the extent and nature of his/her contribution to the work. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of publications and presentations could include:

1. The primary evidential material for research is publication of significant research results in refereed professional journals or in other types of similar, high-quality, refereed publications.
2. Presentations and published abstracts at major professional meetings may be taken into consideration, but do not represent the same level of achievement as published journal articles.
3. Non-refereed publications of research results (such as guidebooks, symposium volumes, contract reports, and other unpublished reports) are considered in a subordinate role.
4. Scholarly books are considered provided that they exhibit evidence of analysis, synthesis, and original contributions to knowledge. However, textbooks cannot substitute for the publication of research results in refereed professional journals.
5. Other presentations of research results will be judged according to their perceived merits.
6. The results of research completed for the terminal degree are not adequate for tenure or promotion. There must be evidence that, after the awarding of the terminal degree, there was the initiation and completion of research, and publication of research results in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

#### B. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research or Creative Work

In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support is an important external validation of the quality of research and creative activity. While no specific quantity of extramural research support is required for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, department expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the geological sciences.

Performance indicators that are used to evaluate sponsored extramural support could include:

1. The quantity and quality of grant applications submitted.
2. Evaluations of the proposal from agency reviewers.
3. The awarding of extramural support which is considered clear evidence of research accomplishment.
4. The performance of duties as a principal investigator for funded research projects.

#### C. Institutional Outreach

Given the University's commitment to public service and community engagement, faculty members may direct their scholarship/creative work to applied and engaged scholarship as well as basic research or creative activity. As in the case of basic research or creative activity, applied or engaged scholarship should be evaluated according to its quality, significance, and impact on the discipline and the community. In assessing the impact of applied or engaged scholarship, evaluations by community partners as well as academic and professional experts shall be considered probative. The characteristics by which applied and engaged scholarship is to be evaluated are included in the Report of the Standards Committee on the Scholarship of

Engagement dated August 1, 2005 and the White Paper on the Application of the Scholarship of Engagement for the Department of Geology dated February 1, 2006. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate the scholarship of engagement could include:

1. The significance of the work to the community and to the profession.
2. The goals and scope of the project (including number of partners involved and people affected).
3. The faculty member's role in the project.
4. Evidence of sound scientific scholarship.
5. Outcome and impact of the project.

#### D. Reputation within the discipline

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research/creative work is his/her reputation within the discipline and among community partners for those who have pursued engaged scholarship. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate reputation within the discipline could include:

1. Solicited peer evaluations are required for promotion and tenure ( but are not required for merit or reappointment). Reviewers must be individuals with established research reputations in the candidate's field of specialization. Reviewers will be requested to critically analyze and evaluate the candidate's productivity and research results. Reviewers should also comment upon the perceived potential of the candidate for continued future development in the field. External reviews must be considered in the light of the fact that they are a matter of open record and are not confidential. Reviewers are selected by the department promotion-tenure committee. The candidate may submit a list of up to five names which should not include former research supervisors, recent co-authors, or research collaborators. The department promotion-tenure committee may select names from this list, or independently select names, for a minimum of three external reviewers. The candidate will be given the opportunity to comment upon individuals suggested by the committee, but the committee selects the reviewers.
2. For promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may also present peer evaluations solicited by the candidate, but normally these will be considered to carry less weight than those solicited by the department promotion-tenure committee.
3. Other evidence for professional research reputation include:
  - a. Selection as an editor, grant review panel member, or reviewer of research grants, journal articles, or scholarly books.
  - b. Unsolicited invitations to give presentations at national or international symposia, conferences, or workshops.
  - c. Distinguished research awards.
  - d. Statements by community partners or other outside evaluators, in the case of faculty members who pursue the scholarship of engagement.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in research/creative work that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of research/creative work is this: Is the faculty member's performance in research/creative work consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and specified by the department.

#### V. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness

Service contributions by faculty at the department, college, and University professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking merit, tenure, contract



renewal, or promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession. For faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, a record which documents continuous and active involvement in service is required. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record which documents significant service to the University, community, or profession is required.

For the purposes of promotion and tenure, service is generally considered subordinate to teaching and research, although in exceptional cases, it may carry equal weight. In no case is service to be considered as a substitute for an inadequate performance in teaching and/or research.

Faculty members are responsible for documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions used for the evaluation of service. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their contributions in each of the three service domains described below.

The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's profession. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. The domains and performance indicators to be used in this evaluation could include items A, B, and C.

#### A. Internal University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators used to evaluate internal service could include:

1. Significance and scope of activities.
2. Documentation of specific contributions or accomplishments.
3. Leadership positions held.
4. Distinguished service awards.

#### B. External Community Service

Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. To be considered as community service appropriate for merit, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used to evaluate community service could include:

1. Significance and scope of activities.
2. Documentation of specific contributions or accomplishments.
3. Leadership positions held.
4. Distinguished service awards.

#### C. Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service could include:

1. Membership and affiliation with professional scientific organizations.
2. Attendance at professional meetings and conferences.
3. Leadership positions held.
4. Significance and scope of activities.
5. Documentation of specific contributions or accomplishments.
6. Distinguished service awards.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in evaluating service is this: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and as specified by the department.

#### VI. Application

For faculty appointments commencing on or after the start of academic year 2006-07 (August 9, 2006), these policies shall apply. For faculty appointments commencing before that date, these policies shall not apply to the tenure decision or to the next promotion decision, unless the faculty member consents to their application, but will apply to any subsequent promotion decision regardless of the consent of the faculty member.

Approved by the Department of Geology

Chair Chae M. Jung Date 8/23/06

Reviewed by the Dean Wouda Date 8-24-06

concur  do not concur for the following reason(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by the Provost/VPAA John F. Fair

Date 11-7-06

concur  do not concur for the following reason(s): \_\_\_\_\_