

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research

January 9, 2019

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Applied Statistics and Operations Research

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

1. Overview of Criteria to be Used

The Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research, Bowling Green State University, has developed the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching and service; the minimum performance levels required for annual reappointment; and the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance evaluation of the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for annual performance review and enhanced performance review develop and execute effective teaching and are actively involved in service to Department, the College of Business Administration, Bowling Green State University, or to the profession outside of the University in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in scholarship, teaching and service.

2. Relative Allocation of Effort of Teaching, Research and Service

Each NTTF faculty member should be informed of the department's expected allocation of effort assigned to teaching, research, and service. Unless otherwise documented in writing by the Dean, the standard allocation of effort for TTF in the department of ASOR is 80% for teaching and 20% for service.

3. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service

To be recommended for reappointment, the minimum performance level is at least "Fair" in Teaching and Service.

4. Reappointment requires that the candidate be active and productive in teaching and service. As noted above, it is not possible to be recommended for reappointment if the candidate is deficient ("Marginally Unacceptable" or below) in either of the areas in teaching and service. Maintenance of AACSB Instructional Practitioner (IP) or other Qualification status is also required for reappointment.

4. Specific Standards for Teaching Effectiveness

General Guidelines and Evidence - Teaching

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, the Review examines the candidate's teaching portfolio which contains all student evaluations, all peer evaluations, syllabi for each course taught, and a teaching philosophy statement. Candidates are encouraged to include other relevant items.

- a. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
 - (i) Student evaluations of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated **(required)**.
 - (ii) All peer evaluations conducted in the review period **(required)**.
 - (iii) Documented outcome assessment results.
 - (iv) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations.
 - (v) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

- b. Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.
 - (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research.
 - (ii) Teaching independent studies.
 - (iii) Advising special projects.
 - (iv) Teaching awards.
 - (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity.

- c. Professional teaching development and teaching support activity; e.g.
 - (i) Syllabi of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated **(required)**.
 - (ii) Teaching philosophy statement **(required)**.
 - (iii) Course development.
 - (iv) Curriculum/program development.
 - (v) Participation in undergraduate and possibly graduate curricular activities.
 - (vi) Innovative teaching methods development.
 - (vii) Professional development related to teaching.
 - (viii) Textbooks/instructional materials development.
 - (ix) Supportive letters (from teaching mentors, peers, alumni, students).
 - (x) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external Communities.
 - (xi) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of seminar classes, workshops or in an interdisciplinary course.

d. Teaching Leadership/Mentorship

Successful candidates for promotion will have initiated teaching or teaching-related activities intended to benefit students or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting "how to teach in my discipline" workshops, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a "teaching mentor", etc. The emphasis should not be on "directing" others to achieve certain goals, but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process.

Specific Teaching Standards

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for both APR (for the current performance period) and EPR (for the three-year performance period):

- a. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they:
 - (a) achieved excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and
 - (b) achieved excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. A typical candidate judged Excellent will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom learning activity (see list/descriptions on page 2 above) per semester; (4) provide some teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; and (5) have a high degree of teaching/curricular development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental teaching conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

- b. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieved a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve a high degree of success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Good will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom learning activity (see list/descriptions on page 2 above) per semester; (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- c. The teaching performance of candidates judged **Fair** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a satisfactory degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Fair will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2 and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the “average” rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see list/descriptions on page 2 above); and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- d. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she fails to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and his/her students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, such as those listed above, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the “average” rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see list/descriptions on page 2 above); and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.
- e. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if

it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

5. Specific Standards for the Evaluation of Service Performance

General Guidelines and Evidence - Service

Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- a. University Governance
 - (i) Leadership positions
 - (ii) Membership on Department committees
 - (iii) Membership on College committees
 - (iv) Membership on University committees
 - (v) Other University governance activities

- b. Professional Activities
 - (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional and national levels
 - (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (iii) Membership in professional organizations

- c. Service Recognition Awards

- d. Other Service Activities
 - (i) Help recruit, retain, advise and place students.
 - (ii) Support department programs that provide services to students.
 - (iii) Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations.
 - (iv) Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students.
 - (v) Administrative assignments.
 - (vi) Advising student clubs.
 - (vii) Oversee preparation for student competitions.
 - (viii) Editorial boards.
 - (ix) Professional consulting to BGSU faculty, staff and graduate students, and to government or other nonprofit organizations (such as those via the Center for Business Analytics).
 - (x) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.

- (xi) Working with Centers and Institutes.
- (xii) Participate in the department's university-citizenship responsibilities, such as commencement, preview days, etc.

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

Specific Service Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

“Substantial” or “Major” activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

“Significant” activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring “some” commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the “(a)” condition below, in general they will not contribute to the “(b)” or “(c)” conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the ASOR faculty who are eligible to vote on an NTTF's reappointment are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the relevant voting-eligible ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activity for both APR (for the current performance period) and EPR (for the three-year performance period).

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year

- serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.
2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to Departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.
 3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.
 4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.
 5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

APR

The candidate must submit the College faculty service report for the academic year to be evaluated, and any supporting documents. Materials to be provided should include, but are not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, and summaries and evidence of teaching and service (outlined above).

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the APR performance reviews shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

EPR

Materials to be provided should include, but are not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, their two most recent APRs, and summaries and evidence of teaching and service performance during the review period, (outlined above).

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

For the purposes of transparency and effective signaling to candidates, all appropriate voting faculty should participate in the process described above during the APR process. They will transmit their evaluations (both in the 2 areas and overall) to the chair, who will relay this information to the candidate. The Chair will summarize these evaluations as part of an independent evaluation in a memo to the Dean.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Overview of Criteria to be Used

The Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research, Bowling Green State University, has developed the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching and service; and the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance evaluation of the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates for promotion develop and execute effective teaching and are actively involved in service to Department, the College of Business Administration, Bowling Green State University, or to the profession outside of the University in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in scholarship, teaching and service.

2. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching and Service.

Teaching is considered to be central to the University's mission and thus carries more weight than service in the evaluation of candidates. Therefore, to be strongly recommended for promotion, candidates must be judged to meet or exceed the following:

Promotion to Lecturer: At least **Good** in teaching, and at least **Fair** in Service.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer: At least **Good** in teaching and at least **Good** in Service.

3. Specific Standards for Teaching Effectiveness

General Guidelines and Evidence - Teaching

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, the Review examines the candidate's teaching portfolio which contains all student evaluations and all peer evaluations for the period being examined (usually the previous 6 years), syllabi for each course taught, and a teaching philosophy statement. Candidates are encouraged to include other relevant items. Overall teaching records of the candidate at BGSU are emphasized rather than performance in a particular class or time period.

- a. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
 - (i) Student evaluations of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated **(required)**.
 - (ii) All peer evaluations conducted in the review period **(required)**.
 - (iii) Documented outcome assessment results.
 - (iv) Courses taught, number and variety of preparations.
 - (v) Appropriate use of technology, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

- b. Effective delivery in non-classroom settings; e.g.
 - (i) Guiding undergraduate research and thesis research.
 - (ii) Teaching independent studies.
 - (iii) Advising special projects.
 - (iv) Teaching awards.
 - (v) Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, service learning, and the like) related to community activity.

- c. Professional teaching development and teaching support activity; e.g.
 - (i) Syllabi of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated **(required)**.
 - (ii) Teaching philosophy statement **(required)**.
 - (iii) Course development.
 - (iv) Curriculum/program development.
 - (v) Participation in undergraduate and possibly graduate curricular activities.
 - (vi) Innovative teaching methods development.
 - (vii) Professional development related to teaching.
 - (viii) Textbooks/instructional materials development.
 - (ix) Supportive letters (from teaching mentors, peers, alumni, students).
 - (x) Development of educational opportunities that connect with external Communities.
 - (xi) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of seminar classes,

workshops or in an interdisciplinary course.

d. Teaching Leadership/Mentorship

Successful candidates for promotion will have initiated teaching or teaching-related activities intended to benefit students or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting "how to teach in my discipline" workshops, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a "teaching mentor", etc. The emphasis should not be on "directing" others to achieve certain goals, but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process.

Promotion to Lecturer

Specific Standards for Teaching Effectiveness

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

- a. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Lecturer is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. A typical candidate judged Excellent will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above) per semester; (4) provide some teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; and (5) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

- b. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Lecturer is judged **Good** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve a high degree of success in non-classroom teaching/advising activities or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged to Good will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above) per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- c. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Lecturer judged **Fair** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a satisfactory degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Fair will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2 and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above); and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- d. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she fails to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and his/her students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, such as those listed above, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above); and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.
- e. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if

it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings.

Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between candidates and departments are made cautiously.

Specific Standards for Teaching Effectiveness

- a. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities; and (c) have taken the initiative in activities intended to help students/colleagues improve the learning/teaching process. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. A typical candidate judged to greatly exceed expectations will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above) per semester; (4) provide substantial teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; and (5) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.
- b. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Good** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities; and (c) have taken the initiative in activities intended to help students/colleagues improve the learning/teaching process. A typical candidate judged to exceed expectations will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of about

one non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above) per semester; (4) provide some teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; and (5) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

- c. The teaching performance of candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer is judged **Fair** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a satisfactory degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged to meet expectations will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2 and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above); and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- d. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she fails to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and his/her students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, such as those listed above, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see page 9 above); and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.
- e. The teaching performance of candidates for annual reappointment review is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

4. Specific Standards for the Evaluation of Service Performance

General Guidelines and Evidence - Service

Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

- a. University Governance
 - (i) Leadership positions
 - (ii) Membership on Department committees
 - (iii) Membership on College committees
 - (iv) Membership on University committees
 - (v) Other University governance activities

- b. Professional Activities
 - (i) Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional and national levels
 - (ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - (iii) Membership in professional organizations

- c. Service Recognition Awards

- d. Other Service Activities
 - (i) Help recruit, retain, advise and place students.
 - (ii) Support department programs that provide services to students.
 - (iii) Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations.
 - (iv) Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative work experiences for students.
 - (v) Administrative assignments.
 - (vi) Advising student clubs.
 - (vii) Oversee preparation for student competitions.
 - (viii) Editorial boards.
 - (ix) Professional consulting to BGSU faculty, staff and graduate students, and to government or other nonprofit organizations (such as those via the Center for Business Analytics).
 - (x) Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
 - (xi) Working with Centers and Institutes.
 - (xii) Participate in the department's university-citizenship responsibilities, such as commencement, preview days, etc.

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

Specific Service Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

“Substantial” or “Major” activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

“Significant” activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring “some” commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the “(a)” condition below, in general they will not contribute to the “(b)” or “(c)” conditions.

Promotion to Lecturer and Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Please note that the following categories are defined the same way for promotion to lecturer and promotion to senior lecturer, but that a higher minimum category is required for promotion to senior lecturer (see above, page 8).

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate’s service performance, the ASOR faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate’s service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least two Department, College, or University committee requiring

substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to Departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least two Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.
3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.
4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.
5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

At the beginning of each academic year the Department Chair shall inform applicable NTTF members of the timeline of Promotion Review set by the College and the Office of the Provost. Promotion Review shall require that the applying NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV), and additional supporting materials (pertaining to the candidate's record at BGSU) for the time period since last promotion, if any.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

1. Overview of the Criteria to be used

The Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research, Bowling Green State University, has developed the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching, research, and service; the minimum performance levels required for reappointment; the standards applied and the evidence examined in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. This evaluation process is based on the premise that successful candidates will receive valuable feedback via their annual performance review, and that the enhanced performance review will be used to ensure that candidates for tenure are making adequate progress in scholarship, teaching, and service.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

2. Relative Allocation of Effort of Teaching, Research and Service

Each faculty member should be informed of the department's expected allocation of effort assigned to teaching, research, and service. Unless otherwise documented in writing by the Dean, the standard allocation of effort for TTF in the department of ASOR is 50%, 35% and 15% for teaching, research, and service.

3. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching, Research, and Service

A candidate who is evaluated as Marginally Unacceptable or Clearly Unacceptable in any of the areas at the time the enhanced performance review decision will not receive a positive recommendation for reappointment. Candidates should also note that with respect to teaching, a "Fair" evaluation during the APR/EPR process may be enough for reappointment, but will not be enough for tenure and promotion.

4. Teaching

General Guidelines

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. The greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching. The following components may also be used in judging the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, which must contain student evaluations, peer evaluations,

syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Additional items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

a) Teaching

- i) Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (**required measure**)
- ii) Student evaluation of teaching of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated (**required measure**)
- iii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching conducted in the time period being evaluated (**required measure**)
- iv) Syllabi of courses taught in the time period being evaluated (**required**)
- v) Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students
- vi) Publication of a textbook (new – second or higher edition and more counts with less weight)
- vii) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- viii) Documentation of student learning outcomes
- ix) Independent or special study courses taught
- x) Teaching awards and distinctions
- xi) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

b) Instructional Development

- i) Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- ii) Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- iii) Curriculum/program development activities
- iv) Professional development activities to enhance teaching
- v) Assessment of student activities
- vi) Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
- vii) Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.

c) Other Contributions to Student Learning

- i) Advisement of students, student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions
- ii) Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
- iii) Involvement in activities to promote department programs and services to current and prospective students
- iv) Participation in University, college, or department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- v) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
- vi) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of seminar classes, workshops or in an interdisciplinary course
- vii) Other activities that contribute to effective teaching

d) ~~Teaching Leadership/Mentorship~~

~~Successful candidates for eventual promotion to associate professor will have initiated teaching or teaching related activities intended to benefit students or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting "how to teach in my discipline" workshops, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a "teaching mentor", etc. The emphasis should not be on "directing" others to achieve certain goals, but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process. Please note that these activities are only relevant for candidates for promotion to professor, and are not expected of untenured TTF.~~

Standards for APR and EPR

Professional judgment must be applied in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance. Overall teaching records over the period in question are examined, not performance in a particular class or time period. While student teaching evaluations are an important indicator of teaching effectiveness, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size of class, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all have an impact on a candidate's rating. Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations, and any comparison made to other candidates would be arbitrary.

- a. The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they have (a) achieved outstanding success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers and students and (b) achieved outstanding success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Excellent will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above) per semester; and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, while not required to be rated as Excellent, could be considered as evidence of excellence in teaching.
- b. The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Good** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of

experience, they: (a) achieved a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve a high degree of success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Good will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above) per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

- c. The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Fair** if, when compared with ASOR faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, he/she: (a) achieved satisfactory success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and students and (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities. A typical candidate judged Fair will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2 and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the “average” rating; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above) per semester; and (4) have a good degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- d. The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she fails to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and his/her students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, such as those listed above, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the “average” rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above); and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.

- e. The teaching performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

5. Research

General Guidelines

The Committee evaluates the candidate's research performance based on written records contained in the candidate's research portfolio. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

- a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities
- i) Scholarly books
 - ii) Refereed journal articles
 - iii) Monographs
 - iv) Proceedings publications
 - v) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
 - vi) Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach and engagement
 - vii) Published book reviews
 - viii) Published cases
 - ix) Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
 - x) Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
 - xi) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
 - xii) Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
 - xiii) Receipt of research honors and awards
 - xiv) Professional development activities related to research
 - xv) Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
 - xvi) Work in progress
 - xvii) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research.
- b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work
- i) Grant applications submitted
 - ii) Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
 - iii) Significance and scope of the project(s)
 - iv) Research funds awarded
 - v) Performance of duties as principal investigator
 - vi) Research fellowships awarded.

- c) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
 - i) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics
 - ii) Participation in University, college, or department outreach and engagement activities
 - iii) Scholarly contributions in addressing problems of relevance to the community/external agencies in the areas of statistics and operations research
- d) Reputation with the Discipline
 - i) Research honors and awards received

The members of the Committee give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline, which relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates may be based on the total research record over the review period, it should be recognized that journals' publication process can be cause delays and intermittency in a candidate's research record. Moreover it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their research career with relatively low productivity, and that this productivity generally grows over the first several years. Further, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity (with possibly some growth in productivity) is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publications will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals and on the impact of a publication on the discipline. For journals ratings, please see the appropriate (by date and AS vs. OR) document, available on the College of Business shared drive, or from the Department Administrative Assistant.

Standards for APR

- a. The research performance of a candidate for annual renewal is judged **Excellent** if he/she provided evidence of one or more A level peer reviewed journal articles (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, supplemented by involvement in at least 2 research related activities among those detailed above.
- b. The research performance of a candidate for annual renewal is judged **Good** if he/she provided evidence of one or more B level peer reviewed journal articles (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, supplemented by involvement in at least 1 research related activity among those detailed above.
- c. The research performance of a candidate for annual renewal is judged **Fair** if he/she provided evidence of one or more C level peer reviewed journal articles (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, or at least 2 new submissions to journals of any level, and involvement in at least 2 research related activities among those detailed above.
- d. The research performance of a candidate for annual renewal is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she has no evidence of peer reviewed journal articles (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, but does have one submission to a journal at any level, and involvement in at least one research related activity among those detailed above.
- d. A candidate for annual performance review who does not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Standards for EPR

For the EPR, the focus should be on the stream of research and the evidence that the candidate is on track for tenure and promotion to Associate. Having papers out for review is an important part of this evaluation and may supplement the number of acceptances.

- a. The research performance of a candidate for enhanced performance review is judged **Excellent** if he/she provided evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research at the rate of one A level (or better) peer reviewed journal article (or equivalent) per year published or accepted during the review period, supplemented by involvement in at least on average 6 research related activities per year among those detailed above.

- b. The research performance of a candidate for enhanced review is judged **Good** if he/she provided evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research at the rate of one B level (or better) peer reviewed journal article (or equivalent) per year published or accepted during the review period, supplemented by involvement in at least on average 4 research related activities per year among those detailed above.
- c. The research performance of a candidate for enhanced review is judged **Fair** if he/she demonstrated the ability to conduct research on an ongoing basis by having at least two total C level (or better) rated publications (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, supplemented by involvement in at least on average 2 research related activities per year among those detailed in above.
- d. The research performance of a candidate for annual renewal is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she has no evidence of peer reviewed journal articles (or equivalent) published or accepted during the review period, but does have one submission to a journal at any level, and involvement in at least one research related activity among those detailed above.
- e. A candidate for enhance review who does not meet the requirements for at least Marginally Unacceptable is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

6. Service

General Guidelines

The participation in activities that benefit the academic discipline, the students, faculty, programs, and mission of the department, college, or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession and the external community will evolve during the probationary period. Activities considered in the evaluation of service component include:

- a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance
 - i) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
 - ii) Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
 - iii) Honors and awards received
- b) External Community Service and Engagement
 - i) Professional service to public and private sector organizations
 - ii) Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups

- iii) Honors and awards received
- c) Professional Service
- i) Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
 - ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
 - iii) Organization of professional meetings and conferences
 - iv) Honors and awards received

Standards for APR and EPR

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

“Substantial” or “Major” activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

“Significant” activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring “some” commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the “(a)” condition below, in general they will not contribute to the “(b)” or “(c)” conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate’s service performance, the tenured ASOR faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate’s service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service effectiveness for both APR (for the current performance period) and EPR (for the three-year performance period).

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.
2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.
3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.
4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.
5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

APR

The candidate must submit the College faculty service report for the academic year to be evaluated, and any supporting documents. Materials to be provided should include, but are not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, summaries and evidence of teaching, research and service, as outlined above.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the APR performance reviews shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

EPR

Materials to be provided should include, but are not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, two most recent APR's and service reports of the previous two years, and summaries and evidence of teaching, research and service, as outlined above.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

For the purposes of transparency and effective signaling to candidates, all voting eligible faculty should participate in the process described above during the APR process. They will transmit their evaluations (both in the 3 areas and overall) to the chair, who will relay this information to the candidate. The Chair will summarize these evaluations as part of an independent evaluation in a memo to the Dean.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Overview of the Criteria to be used

The Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research, Bowling Green State University, has developed the levels of performance for the evaluation of teaching, research, and service. This includes specifying the standards applied and the evidence examined, in order to arrive at the performance level assigned to the candidate. All evidence from the probationary period (generally 6 years) is to be considered in the tenure evaluation.

A successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor must develop and execute effective programs in teaching and research and actively demonstrate involvement for the broadly defined service area. For each candidate, members of the Committee will evaluate the components of teaching, research and service using the five point scale of **Excellent, Good, Fair, Marginally Unacceptable, and Clearly Unacceptable.**

The standards and evidence used for the Tenure decision are exactly the same as the standards for Promotion to Associate Professor. Thus no separate section for promotion to Associate Professor appears below.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

2. Relative Allocation of Effort of Teaching, Research and Service

Each faculty member should be informed of the department's expected allocation of effort assigned to teaching, research, and service. Unless otherwise documented in writing by the Dean, the standard allocation of effort for TTF in the department of ASOR is 50%, 35% and 15% for teaching, research, and service.

3. Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching, Research, and Service required for Tenure

To be recommended for tenure and promotion to associate professor the candidate must attain one of the two following combinations of performance in teaching, research, and service.

- At least **Good** in teaching and research and at least **Fair** in service.
- **Excellent** in teaching and at least **Fair** in research and service.

4. Teaching

General Guidelines

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. The greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching. The following components may also be used in judging the candidate's record. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of teaching performance in his/her teaching portfolio, which must contain student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching philosophy statement. Additional items from the list below can be used to enhance the candidate's case.

a) Teaching

- i) Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy (**required measure**)
- ii) Student evaluation of teaching of all courses taught in the time period being evaluated (**required measure**)
- iii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching conducted in the time period being evaluated (**required measure**)
- iv) Syllabi of courses taught in the time period being evaluated (**required**)
- v) Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students

- vi) Publication of a textbook (new – second or higher edition and more counts with less weight)
 - vii) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
 - viii) Documentation of student learning outcomes
 - ix) Independent or special study courses taught
 - x) Teaching awards and distinctions
 - xi) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching
- b) Instructional Development
- i) Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
 - ii) Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
 - iii) Curriculum/program development activities
 - iv) Professional development activities to enhance teaching
 - v) Assessment of student activities
 - vi) Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
 - vii) Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.
- c) Other Contributions to Student Learning
- i) Advisement of students, student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions
 - ii) Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
 - iii) Involvement in activities to promote department programs and services to current and prospective students
 - iv) Participation in University, college, or department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
 - v) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
 - vi) Provide support to external communities for the teaching of seminar classes, workshops or in an interdisciplinary course
 - vii) Other activities that contribute to effective teaching
- d) Teaching Leadership/Mentorship

Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor will have initiated teaching or teaching-related activities intended to benefit students or colleagues. Examples of such activities would include organizing seminars on teaching in the candidate's discipline, presenting "how to teach in my discipline" workshops, proposing and developing new/revised general studies curriculum for undergraduate or graduate students, serving as a course coordinator for coordinated courses, working with colleagues as a "teaching mentor", etc. The emphasis should not be on "directing" others to achieve certain goals, but rather should be on activities which assist the candidate and others in the learning process. Please note that these activities are only relevant for candidates for promotion to professor, and are not expected of untenured TTF.

Standards for Teaching Effectiveness

- a. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate has (a) achieved outstanding success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers and students and (b) achieved outstanding success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, as those listed above. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, while not required to be rated as Excellent, could be considered as evidence of excellence in teaching. While some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of at least two non-classroom learning activities per semester (see pages 28-29 above); and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.
- b. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Good** if he/she: (a) achieved a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers and students and (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities or teaching development activities, as those listed above. While some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of at least one non-classroom learning activity per semester (see pages 28-29 above); and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- c. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Fair** if he/she: (a) achieved moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and students and (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, as those listed above. While some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical acceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2

and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the “average” rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see pages 28-29 above); and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

- d. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she fails to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair, peers, and his/her students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, as those listed above, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the “average” rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see pages 28-29 above); and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.
- e. The teaching performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

5. Research

General Guidelines

The Committee evaluates the candidate’s research performance based on written records contained in the candidate’s research portfolio. The candidate is encouraged to include any relevant documented evidence of research productivity in his/her research portfolio, including the following items:

- a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities
- i) Scholarly books
 - ii) Refereed journal articles
 - iii) Monographs
 - iv) Proceedings publications

- v) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
 - vi) Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach and engagement
 - vii) Published book reviews
 - viii) Published cases
 - ix) Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
 - x) Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
 - xi) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
 - xii) Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
 - xiii) Receipt of research honors and awards
 - xiv) Professional development activities related to research
 - xv) Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
 - xvi) Work in progress
 - xvii) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research.
- b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work
- i) Grant applications submitted
 - ii) Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
 - iii) Significance and scope of the project(s)
 - iv) Research funds awarded
 - v) Performance of duties as principal investigator
 - vi) Research fellowships awarded.
- c) Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
- i) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics
 - ii) Participation in University, college, or department outreach and engagement activities
 - iii) Scholarly contributions in addressing problems of relevance to the community/external agencies in the areas of statistics and operations research
- d) Reputation with the Discipline
- i) Research honors and awards received

The members of the Committee give greatest weight to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline, which relates to work in the

candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates may be based on the total research record over the review period, it should be recognized that journals' publication process can be cause delays and intermittency in a candidate's research record. Moreover it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their research career with relatively low productivity, and that this productivity generally grows over the first several years. Further, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity (with possibly some growth in productivity) is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at some point in the candidate's academic career.

In order to facilitate the evaluation of the candidate's publications, the department has developed guidelines for rating scholarly publications as detailed in the department's journal list. In addition to the factors described above, rating of individual scholarly publications will be based on the departmental A, B, C ratings of the professional journals and on the impact of a publication on the discipline. For journals ratings, please see the appropriate (by date and AS vs. OR) document, available on the College of Business shared drive, or from the Department Administrative Assistant.

Standards for Research

- a. The research performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research with a total of at least five journal publications (or equivalent) of which two must be rated A or better and the other three no lower than B; (b) demonstrated the initiation or guidance and completion of a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 5 significant involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above.
- b. The research performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is judged **Good** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of an ongoing stream of research (but with allowance for modest discontinuities), with a total of at least four journal publications (or equivalent) of which one must be rated A or better and the other three no lower than B; (b) completed a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 4 involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above.
- c. The research performance of candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is judged **Fair** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of ongoing research activity (but with allowance for modest discontinuities), with at least three

publications (or equivalent) all of which one must be rated B or better; (b) completed a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 3 involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above.

- d. The research performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of research activity, including a total of at least two publications (or equivalent) rated no lower than C; and (b) exhibited evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.
- a. A candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor who does not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

6. Service

General Guidelines

The participation in activities that benefit the academic discipline, the students, faculty, programs, and mission of the department, college, or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession and the external community will evolve during the probationary period. Activities considered in the evaluation of service component include:

- a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance
 - i) Participation and leadership in department, college or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
 - ii) Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
 - iii) Honors and awards received
- b) External Community Service and Engagement
 - i) Professional service to public and private sector organizations
 - ii) Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
 - iii) Honors and awards received
- c) Professional Service
 - i) Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels

- ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
- iii) Organization of professional meetings and conferences
- iv) Honors and awards received

Service Standards

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

“Substantial” or “Major” activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

“Significant” activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring “some” commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the “(a)” condition below, in general they will not contribute to the “(b)” or “(c)” conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate’s service performance, the tenured ASOR faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate’s service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

Standards for Service

- a. The service performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate: (a) participated in significant departmental governance and support activities in at least 4 years during the probationary period, (b) served on College or University committee(s) requiring major commitments of time and energy in at least 4 years during the probationary period, and (c) made a major contribution to departmental, college, or University

governance, or held major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, or made outstanding contributions in professional activities or in another service activities as those listed above.

- b. The service performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Good** if he/she: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities in at least 3 years during the probationary period, (b) served on College or University committee(s) requiring substantial commitments of time and energy in at least 3 years during the probationary period, and (c) made substantial contributions to departmental, college, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participates in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as those listed above.
- c. The service performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Fair** if he/she: (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities in at least 3 years during the probationary period and (b) served on College or University committee(s) requiring at least some commitment of time and energy in at least 3 years of the probationary period.
- d. The service performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if he/she participates in departmental governance and support activities in no more than 2 years during the probationary period, but did not serve on at least one department, college, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy for the bulk of the probationary period.
- e. The service performance of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if he/she did not participate in departmental governance and support activities during the probationary period.

Standards for Promotion to Professor

Minimum Performance Levels in Teaching, Research, and Service

To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the candidate must attain one of the two following combinations of performance in teaching, research, and service.

- At least **Good** in teaching and research and at least **Fair** in service.
- **Excellent** in teaching and at least **Fair** in research and service.

A. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The criteria (evidence to be examined) for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are identical to those for the granting of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate. For the sake of brevity they are not repeated here. Please see the relevant sections above. The evidence to be examined for the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor shall encompass activities since tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, with a primary emphasis on performance during the most recent six year period.

B. Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The standards for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are somewhat different from those for the granting of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate. In general they require leadership or mentoring roles in teaching, leadership positions in service, and the development of a significant research reputation. They are described in some detail below:

Standards for Teaching (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the tenured ASOR faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

- a. The teaching performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate has: (a) achieved excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department chair, his/her colleagues (peers) and students; and (b) achieved excellent success in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, as those listed above. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 4.2 and 5.0 out of 5; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations; (3) have an average of at least 4 non-classroom learning activities per semester (see pages 18-19 above) since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if last promotion was more than 6 years ago; (4) provide substantial teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues;

and (5) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

- b. The teaching performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Good** if the candidate has: (a) achieved a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department chair, his/her colleagues and students; (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, as those listed above. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.7 and 4.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating; (3) have an average of at least 2 non-classroom learning activities per semester (see pages 18-19 above) since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago; (4) provide significant teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; (5) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- c. The teaching performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Fair** if the candidate has: (a) achieved moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department chair, his/her colleagues and students; and (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, as those listed above. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical acceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 3.2 and 3.7 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above) since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago; (4) Provide some teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; and (5) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.
- d. The teaching performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if the candidate has failed to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the department

chair, his/her colleagues and students. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising or teaching development activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidate who fails to achieve at least moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if his/her performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. Candidates who have not taken on any leadership roles in teaching or teaching-related activities cannot be given an evaluation higher than Marginally Unacceptable. While evaluators are free to use their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have a mean student evaluation score between 2.7 and 3.2 out of 5; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom learning activity (see pages 18-19 above); and; (4) provide little to no teaching-related mentoring to their less experienced colleagues; (5) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.

- e. The teaching performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

Standards for Research (to be applied to preceding criteria)

- a. The research performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research with a total of at least six journal publications (or equivalent) of which three must be rated A and the other three no lower than B (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago); (b) demonstrated the initiation or guidance and completion of a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 6 significant involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago).
- b. The research performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Good** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of an ongoing stream of research with a total of at least five journal publications (or equivalent) of which one must

be rated A and the other four no lower than B (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago); (b) completed a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 4 significant involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago).

- c. The research performance of candidates for promotion to Professor is judged **Fair** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of ongoing research activity with at least four publications (or equivalent), all of which must be rated B or better (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago); (b) completed a substantial body of research; and (c) provided evidence of at least 2 significant involvements or contributions or achievements in other research activities listed above (since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago).
- d. The research performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if the candidate has: (a) provided evidence of research activity, including a total of at least three publications (or equivalent) rated no lower than C; and (b) exhibited evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements. A candidate who has not taken on any leadership roles in research or research-related activities cannot be given an evaluation higher than **Marginally Unacceptable**.
- e. A candidate for promotion to Professor who does not meet the requirements for **Marginally Unacceptable** is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

Standards for Service (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

“Substantial” or “Major” activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

“Significant” activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring “some” commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the “(a)” condition below, in general they will not contribute to the “(b)” or “(c)” conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate’s service performance, the tenured ASOR faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate’s service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured ASOR faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

- a. The service performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Excellent** if the candidate (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities in all the years since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago; (b) served on College or University committee(s) requiring major commitments of time and energy in at least 5 of the last 6 most recent years since promotion to Associate Professor; (c) made major contributions to departmental, college, or University governance, or held major office in professional associations at the regional or national level, or made major contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity as those listed above; and (d) displayed substantial leadership in performing service activities.
- b. The service performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Good** if the candidate (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities in all the years since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago; (b) served on College or University committee(s) requiring significant commitments of time and energy in at least 4 of the last 6 most recent years since promotion to associate professor; (c) made a significant contribution to departmental, college, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participated in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as those listed above; and (d) displayed leadership in performing service activities.
- c. The service performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Fair** if the candidate (a) participated in departmental governance and support activities in all the years since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was at least 6 years ago; (b) served on College or University

- committee(s) requiring some commitment of time and energy in at least 3 of the last 6 most recent years since promotion to associate professor ; and (c) made a contribution to departmental, college, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as those listed above.
- d. The service performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if the candidate participated in departmental governance and support activities since promotion to Associate Professor, but does not serve on at least one department, college, or University committee(s) requiring commitments of time and energy for at least 2 years since promotion to associate professor or in the last 6 years if the promotion was more than 6 years ago.
- e. The service performance of a candidate for promotion to Professor is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if he/she does not participate in departmental governance and support activities since promotion to associate professor.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

Promotion Review shall require that the applying TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and additional supporting materials by the deadline for the entire academic years prior to the year for tenure and promotion to associate professor application, or since last promotion for promotion to full professor application. The relevant items to be evaluated are described above.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

The Committee will also obtain external peer reviews of the candidate's journal publications. The Committee's ratings of the candidate's journal publications and the external peer reviews will become part of the candidate's research portfolio and will be forwarded to the Dean of COB along with the department's journal list of ratings (A, B, C) of the professional journals in the discipline.

Guidelines for soliciting external peer reviews

The guidelines for soliciting external peer reviews can be found in *University-Wide Process for Soliciting External Letters of Review for Promotion and Tenure*, which is available from the Office of the Provost.

Approved by the Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research

Interim Chair: *Robt S. Vandervoort*

Date 1/9/19

Reviewed by the Dean: *[Signature]*

Date 1/11/19

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

Reviewed by the SVPA/Provost *John M. Fischer* Date 1/11/19

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