

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Earth, Environment, and Society

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

1. NTTF in the School are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. 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.

- a. Teaching – Teaching effectiveness is measured using a combination of student course evaluations, written student comments, peer teaching evaluations, and evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., “average”, “above average”, or “excellent” on the School’s student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. For EPRs, a pattern of improvement over the three-year period is desirable as is evidence that any concerns expressed in previous reviews have been addressed. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
- b. Service – Service is evaluated by the degree to which these responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

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

1. Procedures for creation and submission of APR/EPR documents.
 - a. Faculty member shall meet with School Director who outlines the APR process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. These meetings will occur in advance of the date reviews are due for

College review by **2 months**. (Hereafter, boldface times are time prior to the date the dossier and reviews are due for College review.)

- b. The faculty member submits a dossier to the School Director **1 month**. The APR dossier should consist of a current curriculum vitae following the standard BGSU template (hereafter referred to only as CV), a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the last APR, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course taught in the preceding year, a peer teaching evaluation for one course in the preceding year, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year.
 - c. The faculty member's dossier is reviewed by the School Director who, after consulting with the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, writes an evaluative letter that includes a recommendation on reappointment.
2. Procedures for creation and submission of EPR documents.
- a. Faculty member shall meet with School Director who outlines the EPR process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. These meetings will occur in advance of the date reviews are due for College review by **5 months**.
 - b. The NTTF member uploads the complete dossier to the University review system. The dossier consists of his/her CV and the following additional supporting materials: a statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy, evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught in the previous three years, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course per semester for each of the previous three years, one peer teaching evaluation for each of the previous three years, a service narrative, supporting service documents, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. **1 month**.
 - c. The School Director makes the dossier available to the Bargaining Unit Members. **1 month**.
 - d. All Bargaining Unit Members meet to discuss the faculty member under review. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the Bargaining Unit Members. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the Bargaining Unit Members holding a higher rank, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the candidate, and

any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**

- e. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

Section C - Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Unit Faculty are not involved in the NTTF APR process.

Section D- Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

NTTF are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. 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.

- a. Shall have a minimum of a Master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment.
 - 1. For NTTF with greater than 50% teaching assignments in the Department of Environment & Sustainability (ENVS), a terminal degree (Ph.D. or the equivalent) in an appropriate content area is required.
- b. Shall have a minimum of six years of experience as a full-time Instructor at BGSU and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience. The Instructor may apply during the sixth year of full-time employment for promotion effective at the start of the following academic year. However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, an Instructor, at the discretion of the administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to the sixth year.
- c. Teaching – Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., “average”, “above average”, or “excellent” on the School's student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom. A trend of improvement in the metrics over the years is desirable as is a plan for professional development. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In

all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.

- d. Service – Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

NTTF are evaluated according to the domains specified in their assigned workload. The weight given to each should reflect the proportion of that domain in the workload. While service may or may not be part of the workload, research is generally not. 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.

- a. Shall have a minimum of a Master's degree in a content area appropriate for the academic unit of the appointment.
 - 1. For NTTF with greater than 50% teaching assignments in the Department of Environment & Sustainability (ENVS), a terminal degree (Ph.D. or the equivalent) in an appropriate content area is required.
- b. Shall typically have a minimum of six years of experience as a full-time Lecturer at BGSU and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience. The Lecturer may apply during the sixth year as Lecturer for promotion effective at the start of the following academic year.
- c. Teaching – Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be better than average (e.g., “above average” or “excellent” on the School’s student course evaluation scale). Written comments and peer evaluations should be generally positive. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom. A trend of improvement in the metrics since the last promotion is desirable as is a plan for continued professional development. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
- d. Service – Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Academic advising of students by the Undergraduate Advisor or Advisor of a degree

specialization should facilitate student success and progress in his/her degree program.

Section E - Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

1. School Director informs potential candidates of the opportunity to apply for promotion. Those who wish to be considered for promotion respond to School Director. **7 months.**
2. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. **5 months.**
3. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier to the University review system. **1 month.**
 - a. The dossier should consist of a current CV, a statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy, evidence for the development and/or updating of course content along with its delivery, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course per semester, one peer teaching evaluation for each year, a service narrative, supporting service documents, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year. Teaching data should be provided since hire or from the time of the last promotion.
4. The School Director makes the dossier available to Bargaining Unit Members. **1 month.**
5. Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the Bargaining Unit Members. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the Bargaining Unit Members holding a higher rank, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the candidate, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
6. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

Section F - Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

The APR and EPR are the primary means for ensuring that a TTF is making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion; therefore, it is important that the progress is steady

over the entire probationary period and consistent with criteria for tenure and promotion outlined in the **Tenure and Promotion Policy: TTF** section of this document.

1. Teaching – Student course evaluations, written student comments, and peer evaluations should indicate that the faculty member is effective as a teacher and that no consistent problems are evident. If any problems were identified in previous APRs, it should be evident that they were addressed. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. Research – Research productivity should be consistent with where the faculty is in his/her probationary period. Recognizing that research products often accumulate at an irregular pace during the pre-tenure period, specific criteria are not stipulated for the third-year EPR. However, based on the typical timeframe of the EPR, forty percent of the appropriate tenure criteria listed below may be considered a target for progress toward tenure. Proposal and publication submissions may also be used a measure of progress toward tenure.
3. Service – Contribution to Departmental, College, and/or University service should be evident. Committee assignments should be completed in their entirety and on time. Service to the profession is desirable as it helps enhance and broaden the faculty member's reputation. Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload.

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

1. APR
 - a. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the review process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. **2 months.**
 - b. Faculty member submits a dossier to the School Director **3 weeks.** The dossier should consist of a current CV, a summary of student course evaluations for all courses taught in the preceding year, a verbatim compilation of written student comments for one course taught in the preceding year, a peer teaching evaluation for one course in the preceding year, and any other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director is responsible to ensure at least one peer teaching evaluation is conducted each academic year.
 - c. The School Director makes the dossier available to tenured faculty. **2 weeks.**

- d. The tenured faculty meet to discuss the faculty member under review. Any member not present can submit written comments. Following the discussion, a vote is taken for reappointment by written ballot by all eligible voters. The School Director shall be present for the discussion so he/she can use the discussion, along with the vote, in his/her evaluative letter that includes a recommendation on reappointment. **1 weeks.**
- e. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required for a positive recommendation for reappointment. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Tenured faculty on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on promotion; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.
- f. The School Director reviews the recommendation from the eligible voters and writes an evaluation of the candidate. If the School Director disagrees with the vote, then he/she shall state the reasons for his/her disagreement in the evaluation.

2. EPR

- a. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the EPR process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. **5 months.**
- b. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
- c. The School Director makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
- d. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank Associate Professor or Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**
- e. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

Section H - Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

See section G.

Section I - Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

1. Criteria for Tenure

Tenure requires demonstrated achievement in the areas of teaching, research, and service consistent with the role of the faculty in the School. While the faculty member's role in the School may emphasize one domain over another, in no case can achievement in one substitute for its lack in another. Criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service include:

- a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited university.
- b. Teaching - Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. During the probationary period, faculty should develop and maintain an effective, high quality teaching program in all levels of their teaching. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to: student course evaluations; student written comments; peer teaching evaluations; course syllabi; course assessments; examples of assignments, presentations, labs, or student projects; grants for teaching; curriculum development; letters of recognition; teaching awards; or supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research. Efforts to improve teaching skills and effectiveness in the classroom, such as attending teaching workshops, are expected. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Specific criteria include:
 1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be average or better (e.g., "average", "above average", or "excellent" on the School's student course evaluation scale) and written comments should be generally positive.
 2. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom.
 3. On-going peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and/or reflect teaching excellence during the probationary period.

4. For faculty in graduate programs, the candidate should be active in the mentoring of graduate students.
- c. Research – Research is central to the mission of the School. Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a responsibility of all faculty members. Because of differing faculty roles in the School, criteria for undergraduate and graduate faculty are different. For all faculty, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same.

Faculty in Undergraduate Programs

Faculty are expected to develop a self-directed research program. The primary evidence for research effectiveness is high quality scholarly, peer-reviewed publications and/or grants. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, institutional outreach, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria include:

1. Publications – a minimum of four (4) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, as judged by external reviewers, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – While submission of proposals for external funding is not a requirement, it is to be encouraged as it benefits the faculty member's research program and reputation in the discipline. An externally funded proposal resulting in an award to BGSU of \$15,000 or more can be substituted for a publication up to a maximum of one (1).
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

Faculty in Graduate Programs

Faculty are expected to develop a self-directed, externally-funded research program. The primary evidence for research effectiveness is high quality scholarly, peer-reviewed publications and grants. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, institutional outreach, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria include:

1. Publications – a minimum of five (5) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – a minimum of \$25,000 awarded to BGSU from one or more external funding agencies. In recognition of the differences among fields in the School and the difficult funding environment, persistent and positively reviewed attempts at pursuing high-quality funding sources will be considered in meeting this requirement.
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

- d. Service – Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. Probationary faculty should show evidence of active participation and contribution in one or more of the following:
 1. Departmental, College, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams.
 2. Professional organizations connected to the discipline at the local, state, national and/or international levels.

3. Community service and external activities that draw upon professional expertise.

2. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Because promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor normally occurs concurrently with the granting of tenure, the criteria for both are the same and are described previously.

3. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to Professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness, sustained scholarly productivity, and substantial service contributions within and external to the University. While the faculty member's role in the School may emphasize one domain over another, in no case can achievement in one substitute for its lack in another. Criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service include:

- a. Shall hold the appropriate doctoral degree or its equivalent from an accredited university.
- b. Teaching – Faculty must show clear evidence of excellence and innovation in the classroom in all levels of their teaching. Supervision of student research should be common. Measures of teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to: student course evaluations, student written comments, peer teaching evaluations, course syllabi, examples of assignments, presentations, development of labs, student projects, grants for teaching, curriculum development, letters of recognition, or teaching awards. Ongoing efforts to maintain or improve teaching skills and effectiveness in the classroom, such as attending teaching workshops, are expected. Contributions to the development of curriculum initiatives will also be valued. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Specific criteria include:
 1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should typically be better than average (e.g., “above average” or “excellent” on the School’s student course evaluation scale) and written comments should be generally positive.
 2. Artifacts, such as syllabi, student projects, presentations or assessment data, should demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being met, that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed, and that the candidate uses effective modalities in the classroom.
 3. On-going peer evaluations should reflect teaching excellence.

4. Supervision of independent studies, undergraduate and graduate research (non-thesis), or internships should indicate an active involvement in teaching outside the classroom.
 5. For faculty in graduate programs, the candidate should be active in the mentoring of graduate students.
- c. Research - Faculty should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review and have attained a national or international reputation in research/scholarly activity. Because of differing faculty roles in the School, criteria for undergraduate and graduate faculty are different. For all faculty, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same.

Faculty in Undergraduate Programs

1. Publications – a minimum of five (5) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, as judged by external reviewers, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – a minimum of one (1) external proposal funded since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. An externally funded proposal resulting in an award to BGSU of \$25,000 or more can be substituted for a publication up to a maximum of two (2).
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

Faculty in Graduate Programs

Research excellence is demonstrated by a continuous record of high quality peer-reviewed publications and success in obtaining external funding. Other indicators include, but are not limited to: publications that are not peer-reviewed, presentations, research awards or honors, and commercialization of ideas or products deriving from research activities. Specific criteria are:

1. Publications – a minimum of seven (7) quality publications in peer-reviewed journals, books, or monographs appropriate for the field since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric. While co-authored publications are considered equal to single author publications, it is the faculty member's responsibility to clearly establish his/her role in the inception, design, and implementation of the research such that it is clear that the research program is self-directed. Evaluation of quality will be done by faculty review validated by positive comments from external reviewers. In the case of exceptional quality and impact in the discipline, a fewer number of publications will be considered in evaluating this criterion.
2. External funding – a minimum of \$25,000 awarded to BGSU from one or more external funding agencies since the time of tenure review. If the time since tenure review exceeds seven years, the most recent seven years shall be the review period for this metric.
3. Other indicators – faculty are expected to be active scholars and visible in their fields, which includes things such as presentations at professional meetings, professional outreach, receiving research awards, and commercialization of research-derived products and services. While these activities cannot replace publications and grants, they can strengthen the record when issues of quality arise.

Appropriate equivalencies may be justified under extraordinary circumstances and used to substitute for the specific criteria listed above.

- d. Service – Faculty are expected to perform service, either by assignment, election, or self-nomination, in a quantity consistent with their assigned workload. In addition to continued routine service contributions, faculty should have made significant contributions in service to the School, College, University, profession, and/or community through a significant and successful leadership role in one or more of the following:
 1. Departmental, College, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams.
 2. Professional organizations connected to the discipline at the local, state, national and/or international levels.

3. Community service and external activities that draw upon professional expertise.

Section J - Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- a. School Director informs probationary TTF of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made. **7 months.**
- b. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the tenure and promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. **5 months.**
- c. In consultation with the faculty member and the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, the School Director generates a list of potential external reviewers of the faculty member's research record. The faculty member has the right to veto up to three names from the list. The list should contain a sufficient number of names to ensure that a minimum of three reviews are received. Once the list is finalized, the School Director contacts the potential reviewers to ask if they would be willing to write a review. For those responding affirmatively, the School Director sends a package consisting of the faculty member's CV, research narrative, School policy on tenure and promotion, the faculty member's workload allocation, and five representative examples of the faculty's research productivity selected by the candidate, along with instructions for completing the review. **5 months.**
- d. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
- e. The School Director uploads the external review letters and makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
- f. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank Associate Professor or Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to

the vote, the School Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**

- g. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

2. Promotion to Professor

- a. School Director informs potential candidates of the opportunity to apply for promotion. Those who wish to be considered for promotion respond to School Director. **7 months.**
- b. Faculty member meets with School Director who outlines the promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the materials needed for the dossier. **5 months.**
- c. In consultation with the faculty member and the Chair(s) of affiliated Departments, the School Director generates a list of potential external reviewers of the faculty member's research record. The faculty member has the right to veto up to three names from the list. The list should contain a sufficient number of names to ensure that a minimum of three reviews are received. Once the list is finalized, the School Director contacts the potential reviewers to ask if they would be willing to write a review. For those responding affirmatively, the School Director sends them a package consisting of the faculty member's CV, research narrative, school policy on tenure and promotion, the faculty member's workload allocation, and five representative examples of the faculty's research productivity selected by the candidate, along with instructions for completing the review. **5 months.**
- d. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials. For a detailed description of the dossier materials and guidance on compiling it, the faculty member should consult the College website and attend the workshops on the dossier preparation given by the College every year. **1 month.**
- e. The School Director uploads the external review letters and makes the dossier available to the TTF in the School and any TTF who have been appointed by the Dean. **1 month.**
- f. TT Bargaining Unit Members, the School Director, and any faculty appointed by the Dean meet to discuss the candidate. At the beginning of the meeting, the candidate is given the opportunity to make a statement or answer any questions from the TTF. Any member not present can submit written comments. The vote will be taken by the eligible voters, who are the tenured Bargaining Unit Members holding a rank of Professor, using a written ballot. Prior to the vote, the School

Director, the faculty member, and any faculty not eligible to vote will leave the room. Eligible voters will elect a representative or representatives to write their recommendation. **3 weeks.**

- g. The elected representative(s) provides the School Director with the results of the vote and a written summary of the faculty discussion. **2 weeks.**

Approved by the School of Earth, Environment, and Society at the December, 9, 2016 Faculty Meeting



Date 12 Dec. 2016

Jeffrey Snyder, Chair/Director

Approved:



Date 12/13/16

Raymond Craig, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved:



Date 1/8/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP