

## Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

#### Academic Unit: **Political Science**

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

BUFM shall be reviewed based on quality of teaching and evidence of service effectiveness.

For Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews, teaching shall be judged effective by the application of the following criteria. For quantitative student evaluations, aggregate scores from student course evaluations should generally meet or exceed level 2 standards which are described in the department's merit document as follows:

This means that for each course, an average across the 14 questions currently used from the Bowling Green State University Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16) should be greater than or equal to the following for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 3.50    3000/4000: 3.75    5000+: 4.25

Student comments from open-end evaluations during the reviewed period should indicate that the BUFM communicates the curriculum to students effectively, and should not raise any significant red flags indicating the BUFM does not meet minimum standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations should indicate that the BUFM engages students and communicates the curriculum effectively.

For Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews, service effectiveness shall be measured by the extent of departmental service participation or equivalent activity involving outreach, recruitment, or similar activity; college, university, community, and professional service is not required but encouraged. The total amount of service should be commensurate with the faculty member's assigned service workload, normally 20%, typically service on one committee per year or equivalent.

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

#### Annual Performance Reviews (APRs)

Annual Performance Reviews of NTTF shall be performed based on the following materials:

- An updated C.V.
- the previous two semesters of quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching (unless the candidate is in his/her first year of BGSU service, in which case only available evaluations must be provided)
- evidence of service effectiveness
- syllabi for all courses taught in the previous academic year

- any existing peer evaluations of teaching
- other materials the NTTF member wishes to include

### **Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs)**

Enhanced Performance Reviews of NTTF shall be performed based on the following materials:

- An updated C.V.
- Teaching and Service Narratives (please see college of arts and sciences guidelines)
- the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching from the review period
- evidence of service effectiveness
- two or more written peer evaluations of teaching performed by a bargaining unit faculty member of higher rank and comparable or greater teaching experience.
- the results of the previous two Annual Performance Reviews
- selected syllabi
- other materials including, but not limited to: evidence of innovative/ effective teaching activities, sample assignments, or professional development documentation (please see college of arts and sciences guidelines).

In their Enhanced Performance Reviews, non-tenure-track faculty may also include additional evaluation components including, but not limited to, demonstrations of teaching, peer review of teaching by external evaluators, presentations in various formats, public demonstrations of teaching technology, and/or external peer review of instructional activities in a clinical or laboratory setting.

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPR) shall be conducted according to the schedule provided by the office of the Provost by the department Chair, in accordance with the department of Political Science's reappointment policy.

The department chair will submit the department's written recommendation to the dean by the deadlines specified by the office of the Provost.

### **Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process**

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with the department of Political Science's reappointment policy. The chair shall circulate a draft performance review memo to qualified faculty members for review and comment. The chair then edits the memo to integrate faculty feedback before submitting it.

### **Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review**

Criteria for the Rank of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:

#### **Lecturer**

- Shall have a minimum of a master's degree or juris doctorate from an accredited college or university

- Shall typically have a minimum of six years' experience as an Instructor and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience
- Shall demonstrate ability as an effective teacher
- Shall give evidence (or potential at time of hiring at this rank) of active involvement in service to the department, college, University, community and/or profession if the assignment involves service activities (e.g., undergraduate advising, active involvement on unit, college, or university committees)

#### Senior Lecturer

- Shall have a minimum of a master's degree or juris doctorate from an accredited college or university
- Shall typically have a minimum of six years' experience as a Lecturer and/or relevant college teaching and/or professional experience
- Shall have an established reputation as an effective teacher
- Shall demonstrate teaching leadership, for example, by mentoring colleagues, developing or implementing curricular changes, implementing innovative pedagogy, or similar measures.
- Shall give evidence (or potential at time of hiring at this rank) of significant, consistent, and ongoing involvement in service to the department, as well as significant service to one or more of the college, the University, community, and/or profession if the assignment involves service activities (e.g., undergraduate advising, active involvement on unit, college, or university committees). If opportunities are available, shall demonstrate leadership in service activities, such as serving as committee chair.

Required performance indicators for promotion from Instructor to Lecturer include the following:

- a narrative explaining teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- a list of all courses taught during the review period, with the number of students in each section
- at least three sets of syllabi and other course materials demonstrating the nature of instruction and the range of courses taught
- results of quantitative student evaluations of all courses taught during the review period, if available
- at least three complete sets of student comments from courses taught during the review period
- written statements from at least three colleagues of any higher rank who have observed the candidate's teaching within the preceding six years

Secondary performance indicators should, if applicable, include the following (A successful candidate shall typically demonstrate at least one of these):

- evidence of new courses developed, existing courses improved, or approval of alternate delivery of courses (i.e., for distance learning)
- evidence of effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning
- evidence of other contributions to student learning

- teaching awards or nominations
- scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise or professional development
- documentation of work with student organizations; and/or
- evidence of participation in professional development activities, including research (e.g., academic or applied publications), attending professional conferences, etc.

Evidence of more than one regular service contribution to the department is required, including serving on at least one committee or equivalent per year. Such evidence consists of:

- narratives of service involvement and accomplishment that documents the significance and scope of activities
- leadership positions held
- membership on departmental, college, or university committees
- participation in organizational activities that promote the mission of the department, college or university (e.g., a program advisory board)

Required performance indicators for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer include the following:

- a narrative explaining teaching philosophy and pedagogy
- a list of all courses taught in the past six years, with the number of students in each section
- at least three sets of syllabi and other course materials demonstrating the nature of instruction and the range of courses taught
- results of quantitative student evaluations of all courses taught in the preceding six years
- at least three complete sets of student comments from courses taught within the preceding six years
- written statements from at least three colleagues of any higher rank who have observed the candidate's teaching within the preceding six years
- Shall demonstrate teaching leadership, for example, by mentoring colleagues, developing or implementing curricular changes, implementing innovative pedagogy, or similar measures.

Secondary performance indicators should, if applicable, include the following: (A successful candidate shall typically demonstrate at least two of these)

- evidence of new courses developed, existing courses improved, or approval of alternate delivery of courses (i.e., for distance learning)
- evidence of effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning
- evidence of other contributions to student learning
- teaching awards or nominations
- scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise or professional development
- documentation of work with student organizations, and/or
- evidence of participation in professional development activities, including research, if it informs their teaching or service (e.g., academic or applied publications), attending

professional conferences, etc. is not required but may be included.

Evidence of consistent and ongoing service contribution to the department is required. Such evidence consists of:

- narratives of service involvement and accomplishment that documents the significance and scope of activities;
- If opportunities are available, shall demonstrate leadership in service activities, such as serving as committee chair.
- membership on departmental, college, or university committees
- participation in organizational activities that promote the mission of the department, college or university (e.g., a program advisory board)

In evaluating performance for promotion to Lecturer, the department is primarily interested in the candidate's development and initial implementation of a successful approach to teaching and service. For promotion to Senior Lecturer, we are primarily interested in the continuation and expansion of the candidate's contributions to teaching and service, which may include pedagogical innovation, curriculum development, increased service, or leadership in service.

Teaching shall be judged effective by the application of the following criteria. For quantitative student evaluations, aggregate scores from student course evaluations should generally meet or exceed level 3 standards in the department's merit document:

The average of questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16 as well as the average of questions 7,8,15 and 16 must be above the following thresholds for courses at each level:  
 1000/2000 level > 3.50    3000/4000 level > 3.75    5000+ level > 4.25.

Student comments during the reviewed period should indicate that the BUFM communicates the curriculum to students effectively, and should not raise any significant red flags indicating the BUFM does not meet minimum standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations should indicate that the BUFM engages students and communicates the curriculum effectively.

Service effectiveness shall be measured by the presence of continuous and significant service to the department, and the presence of additional service activities and/or leadership positions in service related to the college, university, community, or profession.

#### Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The department chair and the candidate will work together to fill the contents of the dossier, though the primary responsibility is that of the candidate. The department chair shall pay particular attention to the assembly of data from teaching evaluations, and shall verify the authenticity of this data.

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

Performance shall be judged based upon research, service and teaching effectiveness, with a particular focus on whether the candidate's performance in these areas indicates progress toward tenure and promotion (See requirements for tenure and promotion below).

In terms of research, APRs and particularly the EPR should show evidence of an active research and publishing agenda. Such evidence includes research projects in progress and outcomes of the research process (such as conference papers, journal articles, book chapters, books, research reports, scholarship of engagement and so on). By the EPR, candidates should show some tangible outcomes (e.g., conference papers and manuscripts under submission or accepted publications) that indicate the candidate is on a trajectory toward tenure and promotion. While it is common for a candidate to achieve more numerous and significant publications in years 4 and 5, the foundation for this work should be evident by year 3 in the form of an active research agenda and manuscripts under submission or at least one accepted publication or equivalent.

Teaching shall be judged effective by the application of the following criteria. For quantitative student evaluations, aggregate scores from student course evaluations should generally meet or exceed level 2 standards which are described in the department's merit document as follows:

This means that for each course, an average across the 14 questions currently used from the Bowling Green State University Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16) should be greater than or equal to the following for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 3.50    3000/4000: 3.75    5000+: 4.25

Student comments during the reviewed period should indicate that the BUFM communicates the curriculum to students effectively, and should not raise any significant red flags indicating the BUFM does not meet minimum standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations should indicate that the BUFM engages students and communicates the curriculum effectively.

Service activities should show that the candidate has been steadily serving on at least one departmental committee per year or equivalent, and that by years 4 and 5 is adding service at the college, university, BGSU-FA, or professional levels.

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

##### **Annual Performance Reviews (APRs)**

Annual Performance Reviews of TTF shall be performed based on the following materials:

- An updated C.V.
- the previous two semesters of quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching (unless the candidate is in his/her first year of BGSU service, in which case only available evaluations must be provided)
- evidence of service effectiveness
- syllabi for all courses taught in the previous academic year
- any existing peer evaluations of teaching
- other materials the TTF member wishes to include

### **Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs)**

Enhanced Performance Reviews of TTF shall be performed based on the following materials:

- An updated C.V.
- Teaching and Service Narratives (please see college of arts and sciences guidelines)
- the quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching from the review period
- evidence of service effectiveness
- two or more written peer evaluations of teaching performed by a bargaining unit faculty member of higher rank.
- the results of the previous two Annual Performance Reviews
- selected syllabi
- other materials including, but not limited to: evidence of innovative/ effective teaching activities, sample assignments, or professional development documentation (please see college of arts and sciences guidelines).

In their Enhanced Performance Reviews, tenure-track faculty may also include additional evaluation components including, but not limited to, demonstrations of teaching, peer review of teaching by external evaluators, presentations in various formats, public demonstrations of teaching technology, and/or external peer review of instructional activities in a clinical or laboratory setting.

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPR) shall be conducted according to the schedule provided by the office of the Provost by the department Chair, in accordance with the department of Political Science's reappointment policy.

The department chair will submit the department's written recommendation to the dean by the deadlines specified by the office of the Provost.

#### Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with the department of Political Science's reappointment policy. The chair shall solicit comments from the candidate's success plan committee. The chair shall circulate a draft performance review memo to all qualified faculty members for review and comment. The chair then edits the memo to integrate faculty feedback before submitting it.

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

Specific Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and Tenure in the Department of Political Science

##### Teaching Criteria

- Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should generally meet or exceed level 3 standards in the department's merit document:

The average of questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16 as well as the average of questions 7,8,15 and 16 must be above the following thresholds for courses at each level:

1000/2000 level > 3.50    3000/4000 level > 3.75    5000+ level > 4.25.

- Written comments from student course evaluations should be generally positive and not raise significant red flags that could indicate the candidate is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom
- Teaching artifacts (e.g. syllabi, assignments, student projects) should demonstrate that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed and that effective pedagogies are utilized
- Ongoing peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and / or reflect teaching effectiveness during the probationary period

Additional indicators of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Mentoring of undergraduate and / or graduate students
- Teaching awards
- Written statements from colleagues, students, or others concerning teaching effectiveness
- Research collaboration and / or co-authoring with students
- Supervision of independent study projects, internships, honors theses, theses, and dissertations
- Guest lectures
- Team-teaching
- Attending teaching workshops
- Attending teaching conferences
- Being a member of a Faculty Learning Community

#### Research Criteria

- Five peer-reviewed scholarly articles (published in nationally or internationally recognized journals) or the intellectual equivalent of this quantity and quality of research.
- At least one of the candidate's articles or scholarly works should demonstrate high quality within their subfield, for example by publishing in one of the major journals in the subfield.
- Intellectual equivalence will be judged based on criteria such as theoretical and / or methodological rigor of the work, originality, quality, importance, and impact. In the case of applied or engaged scholarship, impact may be demonstrated on the community, public policy or public administration. Scholarship of engagement alone shall not be sufficient to earn tenure and promotion.
- New or substantially revised scholarly books, textbooks and monographs are especially significant and are normally equivalent to more than one peer-reviewed scholarly journal article.
- Evidence of a coherent research program that extends beyond the doctoral dissertation; this program /agenda does not need to be in just one area of study.



- Both solo-authored and multiple-authored scholarship are norms in the discipline. The department values collaborative research and does not necessarily diminish the contribution of a faculty member based on the number of authors on a work of scholarship; solo-authored work is valued by the department as well.

Additional indicators of research effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Grant-seeking activity from external funding sources to Bowling Green State University
- Significant, sizeable externally funded grants (in the range of \$40,000 or more) may be considered equivalent to a peer-reviewed publication, although publications are also expected for promotion and tenure. Significance and size of grants shall be considered by POLS faculty with an appreciation for the limited external funds available for POLS research.
- Research awards (e.g. section award for best paper at international, national or regional conference)
- Original research published in high profile alternative format (e.g. op-ed, column, blog)

For Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Merit, the department recognizes the value of applied research and scholarship of engagement. Applied research involves the application of scholarship to address the needs of the broader community. Scholarship of engagement is similar except it makes contributions to the community of scholars in addition to the broader community. Normally, both applied research and scholarship of engagement include a written component and involve intellectual content and dissemination that are comparable to traditional academic research. As such it can be evaluated based on its intellectual quality and impact. If the impact of the work is solely in the non-academic arena of public policy makers, public administrators, and other public institutions, then it is applied research. If, in addition, the work has an impact on others in the academic discipline, then it is scholarship of engagement. Like outlets for traditional research, one form is not inherently superior to the other, but rather each should be judged by POLS faculty colleagues (a form of peer review) based on its intellectual quality and impact. Examples of such scholarship include, but are not limited to: reports, surveys, or analysis provided to units of government, government agencies, nonprofit groups, or other public sector entities; expert testimony delivered to legislatures or the courts; research projects conducted with a community partner organization. The impact of scholarship of engagement and applied research is determined by sets of indicators including but not limited to: scope and nature of readership; the comments of external evaluators; number of people and organizations affected; levels of government affected; policies affected; media coverage; etc. Applied research and Scholarship of Engagement should typically account for no more than half of a faculty member's scholarly output.

#### Service Criteria

- Faculty are expected to perform service either by assignment, election or self-nomination
- Quantity of service should be consistent with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Consistent department-level service on committees throughout the evaluated period is required

- The candidate is also expected to perform additional service to one or more of the following: college, university, BGSU-FA, profession and/or community; community-level service must be connected to professional expertise (e.g. public talks, media interviews related to professional expertise)

Additional indicators of service effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership positions held
- Testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs or others documenting service contributions
- Evidence of prestige and impact of contributions outside of the university community (e.g. to regional, national, and/or international professional organizations and / or media outlets)

### Specific Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

To earn the rank of Professor, a colleague must, since earning the rank of Associate Professor, demonstrate ongoing research productivity that makes a substantial contribution to his/her sub-field. Indicators of this contribution may include publications, applied research, grant activity, and scholarship of engagement. The impact of this contribution is shown by demonstrating the scholar's reputation in the field, which can be measured in many ways, including but not limited to: citations, media and policymaker attention to a scholar's work, awards, invited lectures, expert testimony to legislatures or administrative bodies, etc.

To earn the rank of Professor, a colleague must have continued to be a successful teacher, based on the indicators described below.

Service expectations for achieving the rank of Professor are significantly greater than the expectations for achieving the rank of Associate Professor. As noted, service should include significant service and leadership positions held in at least two of: the department, college, university, community, or profession.

### Teaching Criteria

- Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should generally meet or exceed level 3 standards in the department's merit document
- Written comments from student course evaluations should be generally positive and should not raise any significant red flags indicating the BUFM does not meet minimum standards in the classroom
- Teaching artifacts (e.g. syllabi, assignments, student projects) should demonstrate that courses are being continually reviewed and updated where needed and that effective pedagogies are utilized
- Ongoing peer evaluations should illustrate improvement and / or reflect teaching effectiveness.
- Shall demonstrate teaching leadership, for example, by mentoring colleagues, developing or implementing curricular changes, implementing innovative pedagogy, or similar measures.

Additional indicators of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Mentoring of undergraduate and / or graduate students
- Teaching awards
- Written statements from colleagues, students, or others concerning teaching effectiveness
- Research collaboration and / or co-authoring with students
- Supervision of independent study projects, internships, honors theses, theses, and dissertations
- Guest lectures
- Team-teaching
- Attending teaching workshops
- Attending teaching conferences

#### Research Criteria

- Established national or international reputation in area of expertise, primarily indicated by publishing of articles, book chapters, books, and/or applied research and scholarship of engagement. Number of citations is one measure of reputation.
- Quantity of research since tenure shall be at least the equivalent of 5 peer reviewed journal articles. The department acknowledges that some candidates, due to administrative assignments or other issues during their career, may have gaps in scholarly productivity. In such cases, candidates should demonstrate that their productivity has returned to a positive trajectory.
- Evidence of active research program since tenure
- Scholarly books, textbooks and monographs are especially significant
- Both solo-authored and multiple-authored scholarship are norms in the discipline. The department values collaborative research and does not necessarily diminish the contribution of a faculty member based on the number of authors on a work of scholarship; solo-authored work is valued by the department as well.

Additional indicators of research effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Grant-seeking activity from external funding sources to Bowling Green State University
- Significant, sizeable externally funded grants (typically \$40,000 or more) may be considered equivalent to a peer-reviewed publication
- Research awards (e.g. section award for best paper at international, national or regional conference)
- Original research published in high profile alternative format (e.g. op-ed, column, blog)

#### Service Criteria

- Service expectations for promotion to Professor are higher than for promotion to Associate professor
- Faculty are expected to perform service either by assignment, election or self-nomination
- Quantity of service should be consistent with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Significant department-level service and leadership is required (i.e. service contributions demonstrating initiative, commitment and high impact)
- The candidate is also expected to perform additional, significant service to one or more of the following: college, university, BGSU-FA, profession and/or community; community-

level service must be connected to professional expertise (e.g. public talks, media interviews, op-eds). Leadership in these forms of service is particularly valued.

Additional indicators of service effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership positions held
- Testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs or others documenting service contributions
- Evidence of prestige and impact of contributions outside of the university community (e.g. to regional, national, and/or international professional organizations and/or media outlets)

#### Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion 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 workshop on dossier preparation given annually by the College.

The department chair and the candidate will work together to fill the contents of the dossier, though the primary responsibility is that of the candidate. The department chair shall pay particular attention to the assembly of data from teaching evaluations, and shall verify the authenticity of this data.

The chair informs the candidate of relevant deadlines for tenure and promotion five months prior to the dossier upload deadline. See the Provost's website for deadline dates. At this time, the faculty member meets with the Chair to discuss the tenure and promotion process, including the timeline, criteria to be used, and the material to be included in the dossier. The dossier shall include the following:

- updated C.V. in university approved format
- copies of all annual performance reviews
- peer evaluations of teaching
- external review letters
- C.V.'s of reviewers
- description of the process by which external reviewers were selected
- statements of teaching, research and service philosophy
- primary and secondary evidence of effectiveness in teaching, research and service, which must include quantitative evaluations (including copy of department course evaluation form) of all courses taught at BGSU during fall and spring semesters, full written student comments from all courses taught at BGSU during fall and spring semesters, and published work
- Other materials the candidate deems relevant for evaluation

#### External Review Process

The department shall follow the process created by the Labor Management Committee and agreed to by the Provost and BGSU-FA President.

Approved by the Department of Political Science

Date 2/14/18

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc Simon, Acting Chair

Date 2/28/18

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Raymond Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Date 3/2/2018

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Fischer, Senior VP of Academic Affairs and Provost, Acting

Date 3/5/2018

