

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: Philosophy

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

Criteria used for Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews of NTTF in years One-Six

Non-tenure track faculty are evaluated in terms of their teaching effectiveness and service. To be recommended for reappointment, faculty must be evaluated as "excellent" teachers, and must be evaluated as "satisfactory" in service. NTTF faculty are typically not expected to do research. Thus, the question to be asked during the annual review and enhanced performance review is whether candidates have achieved (or are making adequate progress towards, in the case of new faculty members in their first or second year) these benchmarks.

Teaching: "Excellence" in teaching is understood in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. A number of different factors are taken into account in evaluating teaching, including classroom performance, engagement in activities related to curricular improvement and learning outcomes and assessment, and participation in activities intended to improve one's own teaching effectiveness. Thus, primary performance indicators for the evaluation of teaching include the results of student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching, and evidence of engagement in efforts to improve his or her own teaching effectiveness, the curriculum, and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment.

There are several pathways to achieving an evaluation of "excellence" in teaching. For example, someone might be evaluated as "excellent" in virtue of showing (a) engagement in efforts to improve the curriculum and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment, (b) achieving an overall score of "excellent" on peer evaluations, and (c) achieving, on average, student evaluation scores approximating the level average for courses the faculty member has taught or, given that level averages can sometimes be quite high, achieving an average score approximating at least 2.7 on our departmental student evaluation form (4 = Outstanding; 3 = Excellent; 2 = Above Average; 1 = Average; 0 = Below Average). Alternatively, someone whose classroom performance is at least good as measured by student and peer evaluations (2.0 or better on student evaluations; at least "Above Average" on peer evaluation), and who is appropriately involved in graduate education might receive an overall evaluation of "excellent" in virtue of making unusually significant contributions to curricular revision or revision and improvement of assessment methods, for instance by developing a new minor or certificate program. The department also recognizes that faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional

domains of curriculum and instruction, including directing students in independent research experiences, directing students in internship or coop experiences, and engagement with student clubs or activities. Significant efforts in these areas can also contribute to an evaluation of "excellent."

The department recognizes that in an attempt to improve instructional effectiveness, faculty may need to try out new and innovative pedagogical techniques, or make innovations to the way a particular class is taught. The department recognizes that these experiments do not always work as hoped, that new pedagogical techniques may take a while to develop and perfect, and that student evaluations may suffer as a consequence. Faculty will not be penalized for course evaluations which suffer as a result of the attempt to develop new pedagogical techniques, as long as faculty members show evidence of appropriate response to these difficulties.

Furthermore, the department recognizes that there may be a learning curve with respect to teaching. So new faculty members (years 1-2) may be recommended for reappointment even if their teaching is not yet up to the standard of "excellence", as long as the faculty member is engaged in appropriate professional development activities, e.g., utilization of BGSU Center for Faculty Excellence to improve their teaching effectiveness.

Service: Service is evaluated on a binary scale of "satisfactory/unsatisfactory." The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities, including performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities and roles. It may also include involvement in external community service that draws on a faculty member's expertise, and active involvement in professional organizations connected to a faculty member's discipline. Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

A faculty member who participates actively and effectively in the service responsibilities of the department, and willingly takes on, and performs effectively in, college or university roles as asked, should ordinarily be evaluated as performing 'satisfactorily' in service. A typical "satisfactory" service "load" for a non-tenure-track faculty member in years 1-6 would include one or two service contributions at the department level. Typical contributions at the department level include serving on the Workshop Committee, the Colloquium Committee, and helping with the Philosophy Club, PPEL Club, or Ethics Bowl Team.

Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required, but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define his/her total contribution in the areas of teaching and service.

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

1. In preparation for the **annual performance review (APR)**, faculty members must **submit an up-to-date CV, as well as student and peer-evaluations of teaching from the review period.** For the **enhanced performance review (EPR)**, faculty members must submit, by the date specified by the department chair, an up-to-date cv, and both a teaching and a service portfolio. The teaching portfolio must contain, at a minimum, both the quantitative and qualitative results of student evaluations for all courses taught during the preceding two years, and the results of any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the previous two years. It must also contain information about efforts devoted to professional development, curricular revision and improvement, evidence of engagement in efforts to improve course and program level learning outcomes and assessment. It must also contain a narrative statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogy. This narrative statement should provide information which explains, provides context for, or supplements the performance indicators.

The faculty member may choose to supplement the cv and teaching portfolio with other information about teaching, service, or research.

Teaching portfolio

The teaching portfolio must include:

- a narrative integrating teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- results of student evaluations from all courses since the last enhanced performance review (or, for a faculty member's first enhanced performance review, since the beginning of the faculty member's service at BGSU)
- complete sets of student commentary from courses taught within the last three years
- written statements from at least three colleagues who have observed a faculty member teaching within the last three years
- information about the faculty member's contributions to the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- information about engagement in initiatives to improve course and program learning outcomes and assessment
- documentation of professional development activities, including conferences or workshops attended, courses taken, as well as outcomes, e.g., new syllabi, learning activities, assessment data

The teaching portfolio may also include information relevant to:

- effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote active student learning
- statements of other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, for instance, information about supervising internships or co-ops, activity in directing student clubs, integration of students into service learning activities, etc.
- teaching awards and distinctions
- participation in Learning Communities, e.g., Honors College, Chapman, Arts Village

In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit other evidence of achievement in teaching that he or she believes appropriate to his or her specific case, and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that are appropriate to his/her specific case.

The service portfolio

The service portfolio must include:

A narrative of service involvement and accomplishments that details the significance and scope of service activities and leadership positions held and documents significant contributions. The narrative should include information relevant to the following performance indicators: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held.

The service portfolio may include:

- testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others
- written statements, testimonials, or evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others
- community awards and other recognitions

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

All tenure-track (tenured and probationary) faculty and NTTF with more than 7 years of experience are required to participate in the NTTF APR and EPR process. The cv and portfolios shall be made available to appropriate members of the faculty, who may provide input to the chair about the faculty member's progress towards achieving the benchmarks. The chair shall take any comments into account in preparing the performance review.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

Criteria used for Promotion Reviews of NTTF

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Promotion to lecturer in the Department of Philosophy requires (1) a Ph.D or equivalent from an accredited college or university, (2) typically, a minimum of six years (or equivalent) teaching experience at the rank of instructor, (3) an established reputation as an excellent teacher, (4) evidence of instructional/professional development, and (5) an established record of service to the department.

Teaching: “Excellence” in teaching is understood in terms of the department’s five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. A number of different factors are taken into account in evaluating teaching, including classroom performance, engagement in activities related to curricular improvement and learning outcomes and assessment, and participation in activities intended to improve one’s own teaching effectiveness. Thus, primary performance indicators for the evaluation of teaching include the results of student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching, and evidence of engagement in efforts to improve his or her own teaching effectiveness, the curriculum, and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment.

There are several pathways to achieving an evaluation of “excellence” in teaching. For example, someone might be evaluated as “excellent” in virtue of showing (a) engagement in efforts to improve the curriculum and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment, (b) achieving an overall score of “Superior” on peer evaluations, and (c) achieving, on average, student evaluation scores approximating the level average for courses the faculty member has taught or, given that level averages can sometimes be quite high, achieving an average score approximating at least 2.7 on our departmental student evaluation form (4 = Outstanding; 3 = Superior; 2 = Above Average; 1 = Average; 0 = Below Average). Alternatively, someone whose classroom performance is at least good as measured by student and peer evaluations (better than 2.0 on student evaluations; at least “Above Average” on peer evaluations), and who is appropriately involved in graduate education might receive an overall evaluation of “excellent” in virtue of making unusually significant contributions to curricular revision or revision and improvement of assessment methods, for instance by developing a new minor or certificate program. The department also recognizes that faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, including directing students in independent research experiences, directing students in internship or coop experiences, and engagement with student clubs or activities. Significant efforts in these areas can also contribute to an evaluation of “excellent.”

The department recognizes that in an attempt to improve instructional effectiveness, faculty may need to try out new and innovative pedagogical techniques, or make innovations to the way a particular class is taught. The department recognizes that these

experiments do not always work as hoped, that new pedagogical techniques may take a while to develop and perfect, and that student evaluations may suffer as a consequence. Faculty will not be penalized for course evaluations which suffer as a result of the attempt to develop new pedagogical techniques, as long as faculty members show evidence of appropriate response to these difficulties.

Service: Service is evaluated on a binary scale of satisfactory/unsatisfactory. The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities, including performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities and roles. It may also include involvement in external community service that draws on a faculty member's expertise, and active involvement in professional organizations connected to a faculty member's discipline. Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

For promotion from Instructor to Lecturer, a faculty member is expected to have carried a significant service "load" for at least two years. A significant service load would typically involve one or two significant service contributions at the departmental level, and one or two contributions at the college or university level during the review period. Significant contributions at the departmental level include serving as Director of Undergraduate Studies, coaching the Ethics Bowl Team, and Directing the Philosophy Club. Examples of contributions at the University level include serving on the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Committee, serving on the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and contributing to the Learning Commons, the Honors College, Chapman, and the Arts Village.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Promotion to Senior Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy requires (a) a doctoral degree or equivalent from an accredited college or university, (2) typically, a minimum of six years (or equivalent) teaching experience at the rank of lecturer, (3) an established reputation as an excellent teacher, (4) evidence of instructional/professional development, (5) an established record of service to the department, and (6) evidence of leadership with respect to either teaching or service. In cases where lecturers are expected to do research, the candidate must have a record of excellence in research.

Teaching: "Excellence" in teaching is understood in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. A number of different factors are taken into account in evaluating teaching, including classroom performance, engagement in activities related to curricular improvement and learning outcomes and assessment, and participation in activities intended to improve one's own teaching effectiveness. Thus, primary performance indicators for the evaluation of

teaching, as specified in section E below, include the results of student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching, and evidence of engagement in efforts to improve his or her own teaching effectiveness, the curriculum, and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment.

There are several pathways to achieving an evaluation of “excellent” in teaching. For example, someone might be evaluated as “excellent” in virtue of showing (a) some contribution towards improvement of the curriculum and/or improvement of assessment measures, (b) achieving an overall score of “Superior” on peer evaluations, and (c) achieving, on average, student evaluation scores approximating the level average for courses the faculty member has taught or, given that level averages can sometimes be quite high, achieving an average score approximating at least 3.0 (“Superior”) on our departmental student evaluation form (4 = Outstanding; 3 = Superior ;2 = Above Average; 1 = Average; 0 = Below Average) . Alternatively, someone whose classroom performance is at least good as measured by student and peer evaluations (2.0 or better on student evaluations; at least “Above Average” on peer evaluations) might receive an overall evaluation of “excellent” in virtue of making unusually significant contributions to curricular revision or revision and improvement of assessment methods, for instance by developing a new minor or certificate program. The department also recognizes that faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, including directing students in independent research experiences, directing students in internship or coop experiences, engagement with student clubs or activities, and participation in Learning Communities such as the Honors College, Chapman, and the Arts Village. Significant efforts in these areas can also contribute to an evaluation of “excellent.”

The department recognizes that in an attempt to improve instructional effectiveness, faculty may need to try out new and innovative pedagogical techniques, or make innovations to the way a particular class is taught. The department recognizes that these experiments do not always work as hoped, that new pedagogical techniques may take a while to develop and perfect, and that student evaluations may suffer as a consequence. Faculty will not be penalized for course evaluations which suffer as a result of the attempt to develop new pedagogical techniques, as long as faculty members show evidence of appropriate response to these difficulties.

“Leadership” in teaching primarily includes a sustained record of taking the lead on reforms to curriculum, revisions to program and course level learning outcomes and assessment, development and promotion of innovative pedagogical strategies, mentoring junior NTT faculty, and advising and directing student co-curricular activities.

Service: Service is evaluated on a binary scale of satisfactory/unsatisfactory. The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities, including performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities and roles. It may also include involvement in external community service that draws on a faculty member’s expertise, and active involvement in professional organizations connected to a faculty member’s discipline. Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of

membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

A faculty member who participates actively and effectively in the service responsibilities of the department, and willingly takes on, and performs effectively in, college or university roles as asked, should ordinarily be evaluated as performing 'satisfactorily' in service.

For promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, a faculty member is expected to have shown leadership in service for at least two years. Leadership in service requires making several substantial service contributions at the departmental level, and several contributions at college or university level. To count as having made several substantial contributions at the departmental level, a faculty member must play a leading role in at least two departmental arenas, e.g., serving as Director of Undergraduate Studies, managing the departmental website, coaching the Ethics Bowl Team. To count as having made several contributions at the college or university level, a faculty member must serve in at least two areas, e.g., serving on the Arts and Humanities Curriculum Committee, serving on the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and contributing to the Learning Commons, the Honors College, Chapman, and the Arts Village.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

Process for Creation and Submission of Promotion Materials

Candidates applying for promotion shall prepare and submit a portfolio, by the date specified by the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee. The portfolio shall include a cv, as well as teaching and service portfolios.

Teaching portfolio

The teaching portfolio must include (for the review period):

- documents of teaching practice, including sample syllabi; others might include course projects and other unique assignments or elements of pedagogy
- a narrative integrating teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- results of student evaluations from all courses since the last promotion (or, in case of the first promotion, since the beginning of the faculty member's service at BGSU).
- complete sets of student commentary from at least three courses taught within the last three years
- written statements from at least three colleagues who have observed a faculty member teaching within the last three years

- information about the faculty member's role in the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- information about engagement in initiatives to improve course and learning outcomes and assessment
- information about professional development activities, including any conferences or workshops attended and courses taken

The teaching portfolio may also include information relevant to:

- effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote active student learning
- documentation of other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, for instance, information about supervising internships or co-ops, activity in directing student clubs, integration of students into service learning activities, etc.
- teaching awards and distinctions

In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that are appropriate to his/her specific case.

The service portfolio

The service portfolio must include (for the review period):

A narrative of service involvement and accomplishments that details the significance and scope of service activities and leadership positions held and documents significant contributions. The narrative should include information relevant to the following performance indicators: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held.

The service portfolio may include:

- testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others
- written statements, testimonials, or evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others
- community awards and other recognitions

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

For probationary faculty members, the overriding question to be considered by the department and the dean during both the annual reviews and the enhanced performance review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure. Being awarded tenure requires

being evaluated as "excellent" in teaching and research, and "satisfactory" in service. Thus, the criteria relevant to annual and enhanced performance reviews is whether faculty have achieved, or are making adequate progress towards, these benchmarks. In the case of the enhanced performance review, the review will include a recommendation for or against a second probationary appointment, based on the evaluation of progress towards tenure.

Teaching: "Excellence" in teaching is understood in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. A number of factors are taken into account in evaluating teaching. Faculty members are expected to be effective classroom teachers, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and are also expected to engage in efforts to improve both the curriculum and their own effectiveness as teachers. Thus, primary performance indicators for the evaluation of teaching include the results of student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching, membership on and direction of thesis and dissertation committees, and evidence of engagement in efforts to improve both the curriculum and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment.

There are several pathways to achieving an evaluation of "excellent" in teaching. For example, someone might be evaluated as "excellent" in virtue of showing (a) engagement in efforts to improve the curriculum and/or program and course level learning outcomes and assessment methods, (b) appropriate involvement in graduate education via participation in/direction of thesis and dissertation committees and graduate level classroom instruction, (c) achieving an overall score of "excellent" on peer evaluations, and (d) achieving, on average, student evaluation scores approximating the level average for courses the faculty member has taught or, given that level averages can sometimes be quite high, achieving an average score approximating at least 2.7 on our departmental student evaluation form (4 = outstanding; 3 = excellent; 2 = above average; 1 = average; 0 = below average). Alternatively, someone whose classroom performance is at least good as measured by student and peer evaluations (2.0 or better on student evaluations; at least "above average" on peer evaluations), and who has played an appropriate role in graduate education might receive an overall evaluation of "excellent" in virtue of making unusually significant contributions to curricular revision or revision and improvement of assessment methods, for instance by developing a new minor or certificate program. Similarly, a faculty member might receive an evaluation of excellent by playing an unusually large role in the direction of theses or dissertations, as long as the faculty member is evaluated as at least "good" in classroom performance and has shown engagement in efforts to improve both his or her own effectiveness and has contributed to efforts to improve the curriculum and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment. The department also recognizes that faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, including directing students in independent research experiences, directing students in internship or coop experiences, engagement with student clubs or activities, and participation in Learning Communities, e.g., Honors College, Chapman, Arts Village. Significant efforts in these areas can also contribute to an evaluation of "excellent."

The department wants to encourage faculty to develop new pedagogical techniques, and recognizes that there can be a learning curve with respect to these techniques, and so course evaluations may suffer as new techniques are being developed and perfected. Faculty will not be penalized for course evaluations which suffer as a result of the attempt to develop new pedagogical techniques, as long as faculty members show evidence of appropriate response to these difficulties.

Furthermore, the department recognizes that there may be a learning curve with respect to teaching. So probationary faculty may be recommended for reappointment for a second 3-year term even if their teaching is not yet up to the standard of "excellence", as long as the faculty member is engaged in appropriate professional development activities and their teaching is evaluated as at least "above average".

Research: "Excellence" in research is evaluated in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. Factors taken into account include publications, performances and presentations, extramural support, and reputation within the discipline. Publications are evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality. In terms of quantity, the department expects faculty to produce an average of one article in a nationally recognized journal each year, or demonstrate an equivalent degree of research productivity, where this is measured by parameters including information about works in progress, works under submission, works in the revise and resubmit stage, conference presentations, invited lectures, extramural support, etc. Work must ultimately be published for continued evaluations of "Excellence". For the annual and enhanced performance reviews, quality will be evaluated both by reading the candidate's work (in the case in which members of the department have expertise in the candidate's subfield) and by external indicators such as the prestige of journals and conferences in which the candidate publishes/presents work, the influence of the work as indicated by, e.g., the number of citations, any awards for research that the candidate has received, etc. For the EPR, satisfactory progress towards tenure will typically require having at least one peer-reviewed publication. It is important to note that for the tenure review, these indicators of quality will be supplemented by external reviews. Since the external reviews are weighted quite heavily, and since they are not solicited prior to the year the candidate comes up for tenure, it is possible that a candidate might receive positive annual and enhanced reviews yet still not be positively recommended for tenure. A tenure recommendation requires strong evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by external reviewers indicating that the scholarship represents a significant contribution to the discipline.

Service: The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities, including performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities and roles. It may also include involvement in external community service that draws on a faculty member's expertise, and active involvement in professional organizations connected to a faculty member's discipline.

Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

A faculty member who participates actively and effectively in the service responsibilities of the department, and willingly takes on, and performs satisfactorily in, college, university and professional roles as the faculty member has the opportunity to do so, should ordinarily be evaluated as performing 'satisfactorily' in service. A typical service "load" is 1-3 contributions to service at the department level and 1 contribution to service at the college or university level per year. Contributions to service include, but are not limited to active membership on standing or ad hoc committees.

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.

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

2. In preparation for the **annual performance review (APR)**, faculty members must submit an up-to-date CV, as well as student and peer-evaluations of teaching from the review period. For the **enhanced performance review (EPR)**, faculty members must submit, by the date specified by the department chair, an up-to-date cv, and portfolios for each domain of evaluation, research, teaching, and service. What must be included in the portfolios, and what additional materials can be included, are specified below. Each must include a narrative statement that explains, provides context for, and/or supplements the performance indicators.

Research portfolio

The research portfolio must include:

- a research narrative, explaining the nature and course of one's research
- samples of scholarly or creative work from the period under review

In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit other evidence of achievement in research that he or she believes appropriate to his or her specific case, and request that the department consider this additional evidence.

Teaching portfolio

The teaching portfolio must include:

- a narrative integrating teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- results of student evaluations from all courses since the last enhanced performance review (or, for a faculty member's first enhanced performance review, since the beginning of the faculty member's service at BGSU)
- complete sets of student commentary from courses taught within the last three years
- written statements from at least three colleagues who have observed a faculty member teaching within the last three years
- information about the faculty member's contributions to the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- information about engagement in initiatives to improve course and program learning outcomes and assessment
- documentation of professional development activities, including conferences or workshops attended, courses taken, as well as outcomes, e.g., new syllabi, learning activities, assessment data

The teaching portfolio may also include information relevant to:

- effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote active student learning
- statements of other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, for instance, information about supervising internships or co-ops, activity in directing student clubs, integration of students into service learning activities, etc.
- teaching awards and distinctions
- participation in Learning Communities, e.g., Honors College, Chapman, Arts Village

In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit other evidence of achievement in teaching that he or she believes appropriate to his or her specific case, and request that the department consider this other evidence of achievement.

The service portfolio

The service portfolio must include:

A narrative of service involvement and accomplishments that details the significance and scope of service activities and leadership positions held and documents significant contributions. The narrative should include information relevant to the following performance indicators: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to

activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held.

The service portfolio may include:

- testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others
- written statements, testimonials, or evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others
- community awards and other recognitions

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

Tenure-track (tenured and probationary) faculty of higher rank shall participate in the TTF APR process. The probationer's credentials and the Chair's evaluation will be shared with the tenured faculty. The vote shall be by secret paper ballot and space shall be provided on the ballot for comments about the probationer's strengths and weaknesses. Comments may also indicate whether the probationer is making adequate progress towards reappointment and/or tenure. The Chair, in conjunction with the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee, will count the ballots and prepare a letter for the probationer which will specify the vote of the tenured faculty and summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the probationer identified by the Tenure and Promotion Steering Committee and the Chair.

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

Department of Philosophy Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

In order to be recommended for tenure and promotion, the candidate must receive a 2/3 vote certifying that that the candidate is an excellent teacher, that his or her research is excellent, and that his or her service is satisfactory. "Excellence" in teaching and research is to be understood in terms of the department's five-point scale ranging from outstanding to excellent, good, competent, and poor. "Satisfactory" in service is understood in terms of a binary scale (satisfactory/unsatisfactory).

Teaching: "Excellence" in teaching is understood in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. A number of factors are taken into account in evaluating teaching. Faculty members are expected to be effective classroom teachers, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and are also expected to engage in efforts to improve both the curriculum and their own effectiveness as teachers. Thus, primary performance indicators for the evaluation of teaching include the results of student and peer evaluations of classroom teaching, membership on and direction of thesis and dissertation committees (as appropriate given the faculty member's particular domain of expertise), and evidence of engagement in

efforts to improve his or her own teaching effectiveness, the curriculum, and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment.

There are several pathways to achieving an evaluation of “excellent” in teaching. For example, someone might be evaluated as “excellent” in virtue of showing (a) some contribution towards improvement of the curriculum and/or improvement of assessment measures, (b) appropriate engagement in graduate level instruction, (c) achieving an overall score of “excellent” on peer evaluations, and (d) achieving, on average, student evaluation scores approximating the level average for courses the faculty member has taught or, given that level averages can sometimes be quite high, achieving an average score approximating at least 3.0 on our departmental student evaluation form (4 = outstanding; 3 = excellent; 2 = above average; 1 = average; 0 = below average) . Alternatively, someone whose classroom performance is at least good as measured by student and peer evaluations (2.0 or better on student evaluations; at least “above average” on peer evaluations), and who is appropriately involved in graduate education might receive an overall evaluation of “excellent” in virtue of making unusually significant contributions to curricular revision or revision and improvement of assessment methods, for instance by developing a new minor or certificate program. Similarly, a faculty member might receive an evaluation of excellent by playing an unusually large role in the direction of theses or dissertations, as long as the faculty member is evaluated as at least good in classroom performance and has shown engagement in efforts to improve both his or her own effectiveness and has contributed to efforts to improve the curriculum and course and program level learning outcomes and assessment. The department also recognizes that faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, including directing students in independent research experiences, directing students in internship or coop experiences, engagement with student clubs or activities, and participation in Learning Communities, e.g., the Honors College, Chapman, and the Arts Village. Significant efforts in these areas can also contribute to an evaluation of “excellent.

The faculty recognizes that in an attempt to improve instructional effectiveness, faculty may need to try out new and innovative pedagogical techniques, or make innovations to the way a particular class is taught. The faculty also recognizes that these experiments do not always work as hoped, that new pedagogical techniques may take a while to develop and perfect, and that student evaluations may suffer as a consequence. Faculty will not be penalized for course evaluations which suffer as a result of the attempt to develop new pedagogical techniques, as long as faculty members show evidence of appropriate response to these difficulties.

Furthermore, it is recognized that there may be a learning curve with respect to teaching. As such, tenure-track faculty members may be recommended for reappointment at the mid-probationary review even if their teaching is not yet up to the standard of “excellence,” as long as student evaluation scores are generally above 2.0, peer evaluations are at least “above average”, and the faculty member is engaged in appropriate professional development activities to improve teaching.

Research: "Excellence" in research is evaluated in terms of the department's five-point scale, ranging from outstanding to excellent to good, competent, and poor. Factors taken into account include publications, performances and presentations, extramural support, and reputation within the discipline. Research is evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality. As a benchmark, the department expects faculty to produce an average of one article in a peer-reviewed, nationally recognized journal each year. Publication of a book is not required, though a book typically will count as equivalent to several articles, the number depending on the length and substance of the book. Co-authored pieces of work will be counted the same as single-authored pieces. However, a positive recommendation for tenure will typically require at least three single-authored pieces. Tenure is never awarded just on the basis of the number of publications, but also on their quality, originality, and significance. These judgments will be based on all of the following: reading of the work (in cases where other faculty members have expertise in a particular faculty member's subfield), the reports of external reviewers, and external indicators, including the prestige of the venues where work is published/presented, the influence of the work on the discipline, extramural support received, and research awards received. It is important to note that for the tenure review, external reviews are weighted quite heavily, and since they are not solicited prior to the year the candidate comes up for tenure, it is possible that a candidate might receive positive annual and enhanced reviews yet still not be recommended for tenure. Tenure requires strong evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by external reviewers indicating that the scholarship represents a significant contribution to the discipline.

Service: The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; contributions to a faculty member's profession. These activities include participation in departmental, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center-directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Internal university service includes student advising. Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. To be considered as community service appropriate for merit, performance reviews, re-appointment or promotion, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or University as qualifying. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise.

Performance indicators used to evaluate service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to

activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

A faculty member who participates actively and effectively in the service responsibilities of the department, and willingly takes on, and performs satisfactorily in, college, university and professional roles as the faculty member has the opportunity to do so, should ordinarily be evaluated as performing 'satisfactorily' in service. A typical service "load" is 1-3 contributions to service at the department level and 1 contribution to service at the college or university level per year. Contributions to service include, but are not limited to active membership on standing or ad hoc committees.

Standards for Promotion

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

To be promoted from assistant to associate professor, a candidate must (a) have a terminal degree, (b) show excellence in teaching and research, and (c) have a record of continuous and active involvement in service. The criteria which are used to evaluate excellence in teaching and research, and active involvement in service, are delineated above.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires, first and foremost, a strong record of publishing since promotion and tenure, such that one has become a recognized leader in one's disciplinary subfield(s), as testified to by, e.g., letters from external evaluators, invitations to give keynote addresses at conferences, research awards, conferences sessions devoted to one's work, and invitations to contribute essays to journals and/or edited volumes. Typically, promotion to Professor will require publishing 5-7 papers (or the equivalent, e.g., a book) after promotion and tenure, each of which contributes substantially to one's reputation as a leader in one's disciplinary subfield(s). Whether a paper contributes substantially to one's reputation as a leader in one's disciplinary subfield can be established in a variety of ways, including i) being published in an especially prominent journal, ii) being frequently and approvingly cited, and iii) being recognized by an external reviewer as a paper of significance.

In addition, promotion to Professor requires consistent excellence in teaching and an evaluation of satisfactory in service over the review period (post tenure and promotion). Requirements for excellence in teaching and satisfactory service are as defined above in Department of Philosophy Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.

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

Candidates for tenure and promotion must submit an up-to-date cv along with teaching, research and service portfolios.

The Teaching Portfolio

The teaching portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied.

The teaching portfolio must include:

- a narrative integrating teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- results of student evaluations from all courses since the last promotion (or, for a faculty member's first promotion, since the beginning of the faculty member's service at BGSU)
- complete sets of student commentary from at least three courses taught within the last three years
- written statements from at least three colleagues who have observed a faculty member teaching within the last three years
- a list of the theses and dissertation committees that the candidate has served on
- a list of independent studies the faculty member has directed
- syllabi and other materials that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- information about the faculty member's role in the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- information about engagement in initiatives to improve course and learning outcomes and assessment
- information about professional development activities, including any conferences or workshops attended and courses taken

The teaching portfolio may include information about:

- effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote active student learning
- statements of other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction, for instance, information about supervising internships or co-ops, activity in directing student clubs, integration of students into service learning activities, etc.
- teaching awards and distinctions

In addition to these indicators, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that are appropriate to his/her specific case.

The research portfolio

The research portfolio must include:

- a list of publications, presentations, and performances
- a narrative statement of the faculty member's research agenda
- information about extramural support (including support applied for as well as extramural support received)
- copies of all articles and book chapters produced since the last promotion (or, in case of the first promotion, all articles and book chapters produced during the candidate's time at BGSU).

The research portfolio may include:

- information about applications for extramural funding
- information about any research awards or nominations for research awards

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in research/creative work that is appropriate to his/her specific case.

The service portfolio

The service portfolio must include:

A narrative of service involvement and accomplishments that details the significance and scope of service activities and leadership positions held and documents significant contributions. The narrative should include information relevant to the following performance indicators: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others.

The service portfolio may include:


- testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others
- written statements, testimonials, or evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others

- community awards and other recognitions

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case.

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

Approved by vote of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the Department of Philosophy,
Nov 20, 2017.



Michael Weber, Chair

Nov. 20, 2017


Approved:



Raymond Craig, Dean

11/20/17
Date

Approved:



Rodney Rogers, Provost

11/22/17
Date