BGSU®
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

November 14, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dale Klopfer
Psychology

FROM: John W. Folkins JF
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

230 McFall Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0020
phone 419-372-2915
Fax 419-372-8446
www.bgsu.edu/offices/provost

DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, CONTRACT RENEWAL, MERIT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Department of Psychology
College of Arts & Sciences
Bowling Green State University
2006

Overview

The Department of Psychology explains by means of this policy statement the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the annual evaluation of full-time faculty for awarding faculty salary increments (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 new faculty in the Department and to other faculty upon request, and a copy is maintained in the Department office. This policy statement has been approved by the full-time faculty of the department according to departmental procedures.

Section I of the document describes the evaluation process for all full-time faculty – specifically those for reappointment, tenure, and promotion -- as defined by the Academic Charter. Section II describes the standard allocation of effort along the three traditional areas of performance, teaching, research, and service and the procedures for modifying the standard allocation to meet department needs. Sections III through V describe how performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service (respectively) is evaluated.

With respect to merit, the department endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding faculty salary increments described in the *Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University* and approved by the Faculty Senate on April 6, 2004. In addition to describing the concept of such a system, the *Principles* states policies and procedures that departments and units must follow in the course of implementing their own merit systems. Section VI of the current document describes how the department implements its merit system in accordance with those policies and procedures.

This document also describes how the department evaluates and rewards research activities that can be characterized as *engaged scholarship,* i.e., scholarly work that integrates activities across the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service in such a way that faculty are engaged in academically relevant, meaningful work that simultaneously meets stated needs in the external community. Because engaged scholarship does not fall neatly within one of the three traditional areas in which faculty are evaluated, it is necessary that faculty involved in engaged scholarship understand how their work is evaluated and rewarded within the existing performance-based merit system. Accordingly, Section VII of this document describes how the scholarship of engagement is integrated into the Department's merit system. A more detailed outline of the contents of this document follows.

I. Department Policy

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, 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, timely feedback, professional development, and mentoring. Careful and consistent application of the criteria and standards in evaluating faculty performance in teaching, research, 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 regularly, openly, responsibly, and fairly.

In the spirit of open and responsible review, it should be recognized that some faculty may make essential contributions to the University community through their participation in the University's interdisciplinary programs. Joint and dual appointments as defined in the Academic Charter (Sections B-I.A.2 and B-I.A.3) have been developed to provide structures for those faculty appointments wherein a faculty member may distribute his/her teaching, research, and service activities across Colleges, Departments, and/or Programs. Thus the evaluation for tenure, promotion and merit, and contract renewal of faculty members with joint and dual appointments (Academic Charter Section B-I.D.3) should include input from all of the Colleges, Departments, and/or Programs in which the faculty member serves. The Chairs and Directors of the Departments and interdisciplinary programs in which the faculty member participates should cooperate to develop clear standards for tenure, promotion, merit, and contract renewal.

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) contained in the Academic Charter identify the three relevant evaluation criteria as teaching, research, and service and define the basic requirements for merit, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. As stated in the Academic Charter (section B-I.D.2a), for promotion policies "An academic unit may develop a promotion policy with 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. More specific or more rigorous criteria shall be ratified by 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, "An academic unit may develop . . . more precise statements of what is

expected under teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, or service, but may not add other criteria. All such statements shall be approved by the tenured faculty of the appropriate academic unit. . ." 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 Academic 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. Probationary appointments and the policies associated with them are described in Section B-I.C.2.b of the Academic Charter. Tenured appointments and the policies associated with such appointments are described in Section B-I.C.3 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.

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 range of teaching, research, 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, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

A. Departmental Norms

The department expects its faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort that approximates 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service.[1] These weights will apply to most faculty who are carrying full teaching loads as defined by department policy. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives released time from teaching duties for administrative responsibilities, research, service, differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads or leaves granted by the academic charter or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment and at any rate no later than the beginning of the academic year. Probationary faculty will be evaluated for reappointment and tenure based upon the department's standard allocation of effort, although their allocation of effort may vary from this standard across the years.[2]

B. Individual Variations

The department's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty in the department unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be in accord with the department's differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads, or leaves granted by the Academic Charter made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the department chair, and endorsed in writing by the dean of the college. Faculty on leave shall have the right to determine with the department chair the appropriate variation in the standard department allocation of effort in accordance with the purpose of the leave.

---

[1] Consistent with the University Vision Statement of becoming the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation, the following suggested principle shall guide allocation policy for the Department as a whole: [a] allocations for teaching and research should each exceed the allocation for service; and [b] doctoral-granting departments should place greater weight on research [perhaps 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service] than non-doctoral departments [where the allocation might be 50% teaching, 30% research, 20% service]. Allocations established by the departments are subject to review by the Dean of the College and by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

[2] Allocations established by the Departments are subject to review and concurrence by the Dean of the College and by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Although all percentage allocations are approximations and not exact time measurements, reasonable attempts must be made to insure that a faculty member's allocation of effort is consistent with his or her actual distribution of workload for instruction, research, and service responsibilities. Unless otherwise specified in writing, a faculty member's allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the period of any given academic year or contract period.

III. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include: undergraduate teaching; graduate teaching; instructional development; academic advising; and other contributions to student learning. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied.

A. Undergraduate Teaching

Given the department's involvement in undergraduate degree programs, it considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be an important component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Performance indicators that can be used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching include: statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy; self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness and innovations; summaries of student evaluations of courses taught; peer teaching observations and written evaluations; student advising regarding academic and professional plans; supervision of independent studies; teaching award nominations and distinctions; and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching. [3]

B. Graduate Teaching

Given the department's involvement in graduate degree programs it considers high quality graduate instruction to be an important component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Based upon one's area of research expertise 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, evaluation, advising, and placement of graduate students. In addition, faculty with appropriate areas of expertise are expected to participate in clinical supervision, the direction of theses, preliminary examinations or

[3] Departments are expected to use no fewer than three of the performance indicators in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching effectiveness.

dissertations, and to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty. In addition to the indicators of teaching effectiveness identified above that are applicable to graduate instruction, faculty members should include, as part of their teaching portfolio, the dates of admission and graduation of directed students; placement (or other success indicators) of directed students; and record of extramural support secured for graduate students.

C. Instructional Development

Faculty members in the department are expected to devote professional development efforts to improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators that may be used in the evaluation of instructional development include: course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses; conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that can be used to evaluate such contributions include: academic advising services provided to students; guidance of students in clinical settings and applied research projects, internships, or co-operative work experiences; direction of independent research by students; integration of service learning activities into classes; inclusion of students in community engagement projects; involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction; participation in University initiatives to create a campus wide learning community; involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students; participation in University, College, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

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 or 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, contract renewal, 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

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all faculty members. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because 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, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure. Domains used in the evaluation of research include: publications/presentations; sponsored program extramural support; scholarship

of engagement; and reputation within the discipline. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research which addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

A. Publications/Presentations

Publications and presentations are the primary products of any research project or program and thus are central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes are especially significant. So, too, is the publication of books, monographs, chapters in edited volumes, and other publications and presentations resulting from applied research, community engagement, and consulting. Research should show evidence of originality, impact, and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline, and in the case of engaged scholarship, on the community (see Section VII for a description of how the scholarship of engagement is implemented). Criteria used to evaluate research scholarship include both the level and quality of the individual's research output and contribution of the research to the discipline, and, where appropriate, to the community. (Research and publication on pedagogy are the norms for some faculty especially those whose discipline focuses on pedagogy.)

B. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research

In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support is an important external validation of the quality of one's research, with external grant support weighted more heavily than internal. 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 discipline. Performance indicators include: number of grant applications submitted; agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects.

C. Scholarship of Engagement

Given the University's commitment to public service and community engagement, faculty members may direct their scholarship to engaged scholarship as well as basic or applied research. Engaged scholarship is evaluated according to its quality, significance, and its impact on the discipline and the community. In assessing the impact of engaged scholarship, evaluations by community partners as well as academic and professional experts shall be considered probative. The characteristics by which 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 summarized in Section VII of this document.

Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships and in applied research and private consulting, and editorships or editorial board memberships may be a significant component of a faculty member's outreach. These activities may not necessarily qualify as engaged scholarship. Performance indicators of these outreach activities include: significance and scope of the activity; role of the faculty member in the activity; and documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments.

D. Reputation within the Discipline

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member's research is his or her reputation within the discipline and among community partners in the case of faculty members who have pursued the scholarship of enagement.[4] Reputation within the discipline shall be evaluated by peers and external reviewers and may be based on criteria such as level of extramural grant activity, number of invited colloquia or other presentations, research awards or recognitions, editorships or editorial board memberships, and membership on federal grant review panels. In the case of tenure and promotion, reputation within the discipline is generally ascertained by gathering such evidence from authoritative reviewers external to the university. The reviewers include individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the department's Salary, Promotion and Tenure Committee. At least one reviewer must be selected from each list, with three to six letters included in the file.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the Department consider other evidence of achievement in research that is appropriate to his or her specific case, including statements by community partners in the case of faculty members who pursue the scholarship of engagement. The question to be considered by the Department in its evaluation of research is this: is the faculty member's performance in research 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 level 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, the external community, or to the profession. Given the belief that effectiveness in teaching and research should be established prior to dedicating considerable time to service, service expectations are and ought to be modest during the initial years for probationary faculty. The minimal criteria for service for an assistant professor to receive a tenure and promotion recommendation would generally be met by successful performance on, and meaningful contributions to, several year-long department-level service activities and at one year-long college- or university-level service activity, as well as participation in a variety of time delimited activities (i.e., those that last for only upwards of half a day and do not recur) that demonstrate good citizenship. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record documenting significant service to the University, external community, or profession is required.

The Department defines service as performance of professional activities that 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. By definition, performing any professional service activity for pay (e.g., serving as a paid consultant

[4] External peer reviews are not required for annual review, for merit or for contract renewal.

for an agency, being a paid participant in Orientation and Registration activities) is not considered service. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

A. Internal University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, College, or University committees such as governing bodies, councils, special task forces, and review teams. 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, vice chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators that can be used to evaluate internal service include: membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; and testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators that can be used to evaluate administrative service include: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; and evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others.

In addition to providing service to the university as described above, participation in time delimited service activities that demonstrate good citizenship at the university, college, or department level is also considered important. Participating in the university's undergraduate recruiting efforts (e.g., Preview Days), reviewing submissions for the Shanklin Award, and participating in faculty recruiting outside one's program area are some examples of time delimited or "one-shot" service activities that are necessary for the organization to function well as a whole. Attendance and participation in department faculty meetings are also considered to demonstrate good citizenship.

B. External Community Service

When appropriate given their expertise, 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 and must be recognized by the department, college, or university as qualifying. Performance indicators used to evaluate community service include: evidence of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognitions; and written statements or testimonials.

In recognition of the necessity for research that falls under the category of scholarship of engagement (Section IV.C) to involve collaboration with external agencies, ongoing work that can

be characterized as scholarship of engagement (see Section VII for details) is also considered external community service.

C. Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his or her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service include: evidence of service provided to appropriate professional associations; evidence of service to private or extramural funding agencies (e.g., reviewing grant proposals); leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations (e.g., ad hoc reviewing for journals and conferences); professional recognitions; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; and moderating conference sessions that contribute to the profession.

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. Faculty Merit Policies and Procedures

The Department's merit system is implemented by the Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, which is an elected committee. The general philosophy that guides the decisions made by the committee, the criteria for membership on the committee, and the committee's responsibilities are described next.

A. Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

Philosophy. The Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (SPAT) Committee is vested with the authority to implement any merit system it deems appropriate, provided that it conforms to the policies and procedures of a merit system stated in the *Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University.* Flexibility is the hallmark of the department's merit system. Accordingly, there are comparatively few hard and fast rules that a SPAT Committee must follow, and the decisions made by a SPAT Committee for determining merit one year need not be followed by any subsequent SPAT Committee. In practice there is a great deal of consistency from year to year, but in principle there need not be. The department thinks it best to allow its elected representatives the flexibility to make decisions about merit that are in the best interests of the department rather than be bound by a set of rules that can make no provision for unforeseen exigencies.

Membership. Although most of the work that the SPAT Committee does takes place during the academic year, the length of the term as a member on the committee is one fiscal year. Elections for membership are held in the spring semester preceding the start of a new term. There are five

members on the Committee, including the department chair (who is an *ex officio* member). No more than two members of the Committee can be from the same graduate program area (viz., Clinical, Developmental, Industrial-Organizational, and Neural & Cognitive Sciences). When there are three or more probationary faculty in the department, one (but no more than one) member of the SPAT Committee must be a probationary faculty member. No one can serve on the Committee for more than two years in a row (except for the department chair). The Committee elects its own chair each year, and he or she automatically continues as a member of the Committee for the following year in order to provide continuity. The department chair is not eligible to chair the SPAT Committee. Accordingly, three members of the committee are elected each year. All continuing full-time faculty are eligible to serve on the SPAT Committee and vote in SPAT Committee elections.

Responsibilities. The SPAT Committee is charged with seven responsibilities: *(a)* performing the annual evaluation of the chair and providing a written report to the dean, *(b)* holding elections for the Succession Committee during the last year of a department chair's term, *(c)* assisting faculty with the preparation of their reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion dossiers, *(d)* providing recommendations to the dean regarding promotions and contract renewals, *(e)* providing information pertaining to tenure and contract renewal decisions to the tenured staff, *(f)* evaluating continuing faculty for merit, and *(g)* assigning merit and providing recommendations for merit-based salary increments to the dean. Section I.B describes the evaluation process, Section I.C describes how merit is assigned, and Section I.D mentions two additional considerations.

B. Evaluating Faculty for Merit

Evaluating continuing faculty for merit involves four steps: collection of information from faculty who wish to be considered for merit, independent evaluation by each member of the SPAT Committee of the information provided, review of all evaluations by the Committee as a whole, and dissemination of the evaluations, with a provision to appeal.

Collection of Information. Each year, faculty members are asked to provide an up-to-date vita so that department and College files can be kept current. In addition, faculty who wish to be evaluated for merit must complete and submit a standardized annual update that organizes contributions made during the previous calendar year in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Faculty are also asked to report the current status of all of the following items listed in the previous year's update: (a) papers, books or chapters listed as "submitted for publication" or "in preparation," and (b) grant proposals listed as "under review" or "in preparation." One reason for this requirement is to be able to document the progression of manuscripts from the preparation stage through the submission, possibly a revision, and finally the editorial decision stages, which, altogether, can take longer than a year. Another reason is to discourage faculty from listing everything that they have worked on minimally over the past year as "in preparation."

Faculty members are held accountable for the veracity of the information they provide in their updates. The faculty is also responsible for providing sufficient information to allow for assessment to take place. A faculty member indicating, for example, that he is a member of "a lot" of Master's Committees without providing relevant specifics about those committees does not

allow the SPAT Committee to judge his contributions to teaching against other faculty who do provide specifics. The SPAT Committee is not obligated to include in its evaluation items for which the supporting evidence is scant.

Evaluation of the Annual Update. The members of the SPAT Committee independently evaluate each faculty member in the department. Evaluations are made in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service using a rating scale with the following anchors: 0 stands for "Does Not Meet Department Expectations," 1 for "Meets Department Expectations," and 2 for "Exceeds Department Expectations." More often than not, the Committee has chosen to use half-point increments in the scale, yielding a 5-point rating scale (i.e., 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0), but the decision of which rating scale to use that year is left up to the Committee. The Committee also discusses before the evaluation process begins how to deal with faculty who, for any of several reasons (e.g., sick leave, faculty improvement leave), had less than two semesters of service during the preceding calendar year. Faculty who fall in this category reserve the right to have their annual updates evaluated *in toto* and are obliged to communicate their wishes to the Chair of SPAT before the rating process begins. Because expectations for performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service change when one moves from assistant to associate to full professor, faculty are rated within rank. (That is, all assistant professors are evaluated with respect to one another, as are associate and full professors.) Members of the SPAT Committee do not rate their own updates.

There are no explicit guidelines for determining what warrants a rating of 0, 1, or 2, much less ratings of 0.5 and 1.5. Consistent with the *Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University,* however, the same performance indicators for promotion and tenure are used in the annual merit review, with the exception of external review of the research portfolio.

Review of Ratings. After each member of the SPAT Committee has evaluated each faculty member who is eligible for merit, the Committee comes together to review all of the ratings. As the purpose of the review is to arrive at a single rating in each domain for each faculty member, any discrepancies in the ratings that result from having multiple raters must be handled to the satisfaction of the Committee. There are many ways to deal with discrepancies (e.g., discussing each rating until the raters are unanimous, taking the arithmetic mean of all of the available ratings, using the modal rating, eliminating the highest and lowest rating and taking the arithmetic mean of those that remain), and each Committee is free to select its own method for doing so.

Dissemination and Appeals. The SPAT Committee informs each faculty member in writing of his or her evaluation in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service as well as an Overall Rating. Information on the distribution of ratings within each rank (Assistant, Associate, Full) is typically provided as well. Faculty are welcome to discuss their ratings with the Chair of the SPAT Committee, and they are also permitted to peruse other faculty member's annual updates. (Annual updates are available in the office of the department's administrative secretary.)

Should they wish to appeal their ratings, faculty are given five working days to submit written appeals to the Chair of the SPAT Committee that present evidential arguments for why the ratings should be changed. As the membership of the SPAT Committee changes from year to year, arguments based on comparisons between the current and previous year's ratings may not be as convincing as those showing that the body of work being evaluated deserves a higher rating. The SPAT Committee shall reconvene not less than one week after having informed faculty of their evaluations to resolve all appeals and transmit the final ratings to the department chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair of SPAT to inform faculty who appealed their ratings of the outcome of their appeals. Upon receiving the final ratings from the SPAT Committee, the department chair cannot alter them before sending them to the College.

C. Assigning Merit

In accordance with the *Principles*, the annual merit review is based upon the accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis (i.e., each year, new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file). The department recognizes and rewards continuing faculty members based on its own policies and the criteria stated in the Academic Charter, which establish standards of performance indicating whether a faculty member (a) qualifies for merit by meeting or exceeding department standards or (b) does not qualify for a merit increase.

The department chair informs the SPAT Committee of the size of the salary increment as soon as that information becomes available. The university has established the following policies on the distribution of merit pay:

1. The total merit pool for continuing faculty salary increments in a given year shall be allocated as follows: fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool shall be distributed to all continuing faculty who qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding department expectations in their annual performance reviews. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool shall be allocated to departments for recognition of those faculty members whose level of performance exceeds expectations, as defined by the department's internal merit policy.

2. Any faculty member who does not qualify for merit in his or her annual performance review is not to receive a salary increase.

The SPAT Committee computes the three-year averages for each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service and weights those averages by the faculty member's designated allocation of effort (typically, 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service). The weighted averages are added together to yield a single number between 0 and 2.0 that summarizes a faculty member's overall performance during the most recent three-year period. That single number is used to determine whether a faculty member has not met department expectations, met expectations, or exceeded expectations. If a faculty member falls in the first category, no merit is awarded. If he or she falls in the second category, 50% of the merit pool is distributed among all faculty who met or exceeded expectations. The remaining 50% of the merit pool is distributed only among faculty whose performance over the past three years puts them in the "exceeded expectations" category.

Each SPAT Committee chooses the numerical cut-offs for determining the width of those three categories. For example, with a weighted score of 1.0 representing "meets expectations," one SPAT Committee may decide that any score greater than 1.25 should qualify one for some portion of the "exceeds expectations" merit pool whereas another may set the cut-off for "exceeds expectations" at 1.75. The location of these cut-offs influences the size of the merit increments.

The SPAT Committee also decides whether to award increments as a flat-rate, as a fixed percentage of the base salary, or some combination of both. Under a flat-rate system, everyone who received, say, a score of 2.0 would receive the same increment (e.g., $500) regardless of rank or base salary. With fixed percentage increments, everyone receiving a score of 2.0 would receive the same proportional increase (e.g., 1%) in his or her base salary.

D. Additional Considerations

Merit Evaluations and Promotion and Tenure Decisions. Receiving positive evaluations for merit does not necessarily mean that promotion or tenure evaluations will be positive. The primary reason for why this may be the case is that external reviews are not gathered during the merit process, but they are for promotion and tenure. External reviews carry significant weight in promotion and tenure decisions.

New Faculty. When a new faculty member's contract begins in July or August, only a limited amount of information is available for his or her first merit cycle. So that new faculty are not penalized for this lack of information, they will receive a merit increment that is either based on the average ratings for faculty in their cohort (e.g., the average ratings for all assistant professors) or is equal to the percentage increment upon which that year's merit pool is based, whichever is larger.

VII. Integration of Scholarship of Engagement

The department is committed to recognizing and rewarding scholarly activities that qualify as scholarship of engagement. The Standards Committee on the Scholarship of Engagement, appointed by President Ribeau on April 5, 2005, was charged with developing standards for evaluating and assessing scholarship of engagement at BGSU. These standards essentially define scholarship of engagement at the university, making it easy to determine what qualifies as engaged scholarship and what does not. The *Report of the Standards Committee on the Scholarship of Engagement*, issued on August 1, 2005, included seven defining characteristics of the scholarship of engagement, which state that scholarship of engagement: (1) asks questions that are of significance for the community as well as the discipline or interdisciplinary area; (2) is placed in the existing context of existing scholarship and community practice; (3) uses methodology that is clearly defined and appropriate; (4) yields results that are significant and have an impact on the discipline (or interdisciplinary area) as well as the community; (5) has results that are communicated and disseminated to appropriate academic and public audiences; (6) is work that is reviewed by scholarly peers as well as community partners who assess its rigor, integrity, originality, and contribution; and (7) requires that the partners engage in reflection on the

collaborative process. Section VII.A presents the philosophy underlying the integration of engaged scholarship with the department's merit system, and Section VII.B describes the implementation of that philosophy.

A. Philosophy

First, the department holds that scholarship of engagement activities are, first and foremost, research activities and that engaged research should be evaluated using the same criteria used to evaluate non-engaged research. That is, peer-reviewed publications are considered to have met a higher standard than presentations at professional conferences, which themselves meet a higher standard than, say, posting the results of engaged research on a non-juried web site.

Second, faculty members in the department routinely engage in applied research that has many of the characteristics of scholarship of engagement, and they publish their findings in academic journals that are in the mainstream of applied academic work. As the *Report of the Standards Committee* indicates, scholarship of engagement takes applied research several steps further by introducing another layer of evaluation to the traditional peer-review process. So as not to discourage faculty from becoming engaged in the scholarship of engagement, the department takes the position that engaged research need not be published in mainstream journals to have value. The department also recognizes that reaching both an academic and a more public audience may require publishing reports of the same general body of work in two different venues, an academic and a practitioner journal, for example. (Before doing so, however, researchers are encouraged to consult the guidelines of the American Psychological Association that discourages duplicate publication.) Regardless of the publication outlet, it is expected that published material will have gone through a peer-review process. In addition, as stated in Section V.B, engaged research is one way to provide service to the community, so the scholarship of engagement qualifies as both research and service.

Finally, the department does not expect all faculty members to pursue the scholarship of engagement. Indeed, because engaged scholarship may take longer to execute than traditional research, may result in publications that appear in non-mainstream venues, and has additional requirements to satisfy, faculty – particularly probationary faculty – should discuss with the department chair or chair designate their intent to pursue an engaged research project so that a plan can be made for satisfying the additional requirements. The elements of such a plan are described next.

B. Implementing the Scholarship of Engagement

The characteristics of engaged research that go beyond traditional basic or applied research include: showing that the work has an impact on the community (see Characteristic 4), disseminating the results to appropriate public audiences (see Characteristic 5), ensuring that the work is reviewed by community partners (Characteristic 6), and showing that the university and community partners have reflected upon the collaboration (Characteristic 7).

Showing Community Impact. This aspect of engaged scholarship ought to be discussed among the partners before the research is carried out. In some cases, such as a program evaluation of a community intervention, showing community impact may be a component of the engaged research

itself. Determining the impact of the work on the community may rely on quantitative or qualitative methods.

Sharing with the Public. Given that it is unlikely that people from the community will read reports of the research in academic journals, it is important that the appropriate community audience by identified and given the opportunity to learn about the research. At minimum, the partners could report the results of their research on a web site that can be universally accessed (i.e., not in a closed domain such as Blackboard). Depending upon the nature of the project and the targeted audience, public lectures or workshops could be given, pamphlets could be distributed, or local news media may be contacted. It is likely that the community partner will have a good sense of how to share the research findings with the public.

Review by Community Partners. Characteristic 6 holds that the work should undergo a review by community partners as well as by scholarly peers. We assume that the "community partners" referred to here are different from those who are involved with the research, for we interpret the purpose of this review is to have a different set of eyes evaluate the project. Accordingly, the department will create an Advisory Board for the Scholarship of Engagement whose members will consist of ten graduate alumni who do not work in academic settings. Members of the Advisory Board will be selected based on their areas of expertise so as to provide as broad a coverage of the field as is possible. When a faculty member decides to embark on an engaged research project, he or she would form a two- or three-member ad hoc Review Team consisting of at least one member of the Advisory Board. Members of the Review Team would be required to hold a doctoral degree but not necessarily from the BGSU Psychology Department. Where appropriate, local community leaders who do not hold doctoral degrees may be asked to serve as ad hoc members of the Advisory Panel. The researcher will work with the Advisory Board member to set up an appropriate Review Team. The Review Team is charged with evaluating the final research project in terms of its rigor, integrity, originality, and contribution. Although similar to the role played by the group of people chosen to review a manuscript for a journal, the role of the Review Team differs in that the researchers are encouraged to seek advice from the Team for ways to improve the research before it is carried out. Considering that engaged research projects are intended to have direct impact on the community, it is important that research partners be allowed to obtain advice from Team members before embarking on data collection, particularly if Team members have expertise in the area of interest. Thus, the review by Review Team members can be an ongoing process and not necessarily limited to a *post factum* review. Advisory Board members will be asked to serve a three-year term.

Reflecting on the Collaboration. Characteristic 7 notes that reflection is an important aspect of engaged research, suggesting that "project partners should therefore, at the beginning of the project, establish an ongoing process of reflection using criteria and forms of communication appropriate to the project and its constituencies." In addition, it is held that "[i]deally the process of reflection and its results should also be included in the dissemination of the project to its respective evaluative communities." The department recognizes the value and importance of reflection and deems it highly unlikely that any truly collaborative project could be done in the absence of regular, ongoing reflection. All collaborative research projects that are carried out by

members of the department are already punctuated with regular (e.g., weekly or bi-weekly) meetings to reflect upon the research process; scholarship of engagement is not uniquely characterized by having a reflection component. Research partners in the scholarship of engagement are invited to submit evidence of their ongoing reflections to their designated Advisory Panel reviewers, but doing so is not required.

C. Additional Considerations

As faculty become increasingly involved in the Scholarship of Engagement, the department may discover that aspects of the current policy need to be modified or that new policies and procedures would need to be included. Accordingly, the current policy will undergo periodic review every three years with the expectation that some fine tuning of the current policy will need to be done.

VIII. Application

For faculty appointments commencing on or after July 1, 2006, these policies shall apply. For faculty appointments commencing before that date, policies in place at the time of appointment shall apply to the tenure decision or to the next promotion decision, but these policies will apply to any subsequent promotion decision. However, a faculty member appointed while previous policies were in place may elect in writing to request the application of these policies as general standards for contract renewal, promotion, or tenure.

IX. Review

A review of these departmental policies may occur at any time at the initiative of the Department, College, or Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Any amendments to these policies must be endorsed by the tenured faculty of the Department and concurred by the Dean of the College and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Approved by the Department of Psychology, August 22, 2006

Chair _____ Date 26 Sep 2006

Concurred by the Dean _____ Date 11-13-06

Concurred by the Provost/VPAA _____ Date 11-14-6

The template from which this document was developed was approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 1997