REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

PART II: ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA: STANDARDS AND PROCESSES

SCHOOL OF ART

ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS USED IN APRS AND EPRS OF QRF IN YEARS ONE TO SIX
QRF 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. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required but can be included if the candidate feels that they better define their total contribution.

a. Teaching – The standard allocation of teaching for QRF is 80%. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by faculty, and not graduate students. Written comments should be generally positive and not raise frequent concerns over teaching. Peer evaluations should also 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. Consistent positive evaluations or 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.

b. Service -- The standard allocation of service for QRF is 20%. Faculty perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. It is expected that QRF candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year.

ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS USED IN QRF PROMOTION REVIEW
Criteria for Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor: QRF 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. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required but may be included if the candidate feels that they better define their total contribution in teaching and service.

Rank qualifications and promotion eligibility for all BGSU faculty are addressed in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The School of Art-specific promotion criteria are as follows.

a. Teaching – The standard allocation of teaching for QRF is 80%. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by peer faculty (not graduate students). Written comments should be generally positive and not raise frequent concerns over teaching. Peer evaluations should also 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. Consistent positive evaluations or 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.

b. Service - The standard allocation of service for QRF is 20%. Faculty perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. It is expected that QRF candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year.

Criteria for Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF- Professor: QRF 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. Contributions in areas other than the assigned workload are not required but may be included if the candidate feels that they better define the total contribution. Promotion to **QRF-Professor** requires leadership in teaching and service (as defined below).

Rank qualifications and promotion eligibility for all BGSU faculty are addressed in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The School of Art-specific promotion criteria are as follows.

a. Teaching - The standard allocation of teaching for QRF is 80%. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by peer faculty (not graduate students). Written comments should be generally positive and not raise frequent concerns over teaching. Peer evaluations should also 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. Consistent positive evaluations or a trend of improvement in the metrics over the years is desirable as is a plan for professional development. Promotion to **QRF-Professor** requires pedagogical leadership as demonstrated by such activities as mentoring of junior faculty and graduate students, curricular development and attendance and presentations at teaching workshops and conferences.

b. Service - The standard allocation of service for QRF is 20%. Service leadership is expected for candidates applying for promotion to **QRF-Professor**. Service leadership may occur at the Department, College or University level as well as at the community level. Faculty perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. It is expected that QRF candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year including activity at the College or University level. In addition, successful candidates shall demonstrate some leadership roles (e.g. committee chair or central role in significant service undertaking).

ACADEMIC UNIT PROCEDURES FOR CREATION AND SUBMISSION OF QRF-PROMOTION MATERIALS
Faculty member uploads the complete dossier to the University review system.

The dossier should consist of a current CV, teaching and service narratives, supporting materials for the narratives, student course evaluations since the date of hire or last promotion (which must include original quantitative and qualitative student evaluation reports for each course taught), at least one peer teaching evaluation for each year, and other materials the candidate feels are relevant to meeting the criteria stated above. The School Director will upload all student evaluations (quantitative

and qualitative responses) and is responsible for ensuring that 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.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost, codified in the School of Art annual RPT calendar.

ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS USED IN APRS AND EPRS OF TTF
The Annual Performance Review (APR) and the Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) are the primary means for ensuring that a TTF is making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion. Progress should be steady over the entire probationary period and consistent with the criteria for tenure and promotion outlined below. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing performance reviews shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

a. Teaching – The standard allocation of teaching for TTF is 40%. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by peer faculty (not graduate students). Written comments should be generally positive and not raise frequent concerns over teaching. Peer evaluations should also 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. Consistent positive evaluations or 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.

b. Scholarly/Creative Activity – The standard allocation for Scholarly/Creative activity for TTF is 40%. Scholarly/Creative Activity refers to scholarship, creative work, basic research leading to scholarly or creative products, or other activities relevant to the academic practice in a given area. Activity should be consistent across the initial probationary appointment, though the School of Art recognizes that scholarly/creative products may accumulate at an irregular pace. By the time of EPR the candidate should show productivity that equates with approximately forty percent of the productivity expected for a successful tenure candidacy, based on the types of activities described in the Scholarly/Creative Activity section of the Standards for Tenure listed below.

c. Service - The standard allocation of service for TTF is 20%. Faculty perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. It is expected that TTF candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year.

ACADEMIC UNIT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS USED IN TTF TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW
Standards for Tenure: Tenure requires demonstrated achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service consistent with the role of the faculty member 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 domain substitute for its lack in another.

Rank qualifications and promotion eligibility for all BGSU faculty are addressed in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The School of Art-specific tenure and promotion criteria are as follows.

a. Teaching - The standard allocation of teaching for TTF is 40%. 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; positive student and peer evaluations, positive student written comments, course artifacts such as syllabi and course assessments, examples of assignments, presentations, labs, or student projects that show clear articulation of learning outcomes and student progress toward those outcomes, 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. Specific criteria include:

1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by peer faculty (not graduate students) and written comments should be generally positive and not raise significant concerns over teaching.
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 involved with graduate teaching the candidate should be active in the mentoring of graduate students.

b. Scholarly/Creative Activity – The standard allocation of scholarly/creative activity for TTF is 40%. Scholarly and creative activity is central to the mission of the School. Faculty are expected to develop self-directed scholarly/creative activity that results in scholarly, studio, or a hybrid of scholarly and studio activity. The School of Art is comprised of different disciplines within the visual arts and the humanities (Studio Art, Graphic Design, Digital Arts, Art Education, Art History). Within each discipline further differences in trajectory and a corresponding range of quantity of accomplishments are employed to evaluate faculty activity.

The following is an example list of Primary Indicators of activity most relevant to faculty in each of the School's five divisions.

- Studio Division candidates will typically participate in 12 significant juried exhibitions or present 3 solo exhibitions to achieve tenure. Two major external grant awards with peer reviewed output would also be primary indicators of achievement and may count for up to four of the twelve juried exhibitions and one of the three solo exhibitions.
- Digital Arts Division candidates will typically participate in 12 significant juried exhibitions or present 3 solo exhibitions to achieve tenure. Alternatively, a digital arts faculty member will typically participate in one festival acceptance for feature length presentations or 6 festival acceptances for short animations including multiple screenings. Two major external grant awards with peer reviewed output would also be primary indicators of achievement and may count for up to 4 of the 12 juried exhibitions and up to 2 of the 6 festival acceptances.

- Graphic Design Division candidates will typically receive 5 art or design awards or undertake 5 significant design commissions to achieve tenure. Major external grants or scholarship of engagement projects are also primary indicators of achievement and are equivalent to design awards and commissions. Scholarship of engagement projects are affirmed through discipline-based acknowledgement and appropriate documentation of community impact (see below).
- Art Education Division candidates will typically publish one scholarly book or monograph or one edited volume plus 2 articles or 5 chapters in peer reviewed books or 5 articles in peer reviewed journals (including pedagogy) to achieve tenure. Significant external grants may substitute for up to 2 articles/chapters or for one curated exhibition at a national institution accompanied by a catalogue.
- Art History Division candidates might publish one scholarly book or monograph or one edited volume plus 2 edited articles or 5 chapters in peer reviewed books or 5 articles in peer reviewed journals (including pedagogy) to achieve tenure. Significant external grants may substitute for up to 2 articles/chapters or one curated exhibition at a national institution accompanied by a catalogue.

This list is illustrative and thus may not capture the full range of scholarly/creative activity undertaken by School of Art faculty members. A candidate may present a dossier that combines types of activities, and some candidates may choose to work in both studio and scholarly domains. For all faculty members, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same. Although sustained productivity is valued, quantity cannot substitute for quality of contributions to the field or be considered as the sole criterion for evaluation. Quality is measured by eligible School of Art faculty members assessing the rigor of peer review and jurying, the prestige of exhibition/performance venues and the prestige of publications or publishers. Reviews written by external evaluators will also be an important component in assessing the disciplinary impact of the candidate's work. Candidates for tenure must demonstrate quality and a level of productivity commensurate with an emerging national reputation.

Co-authored work is valued. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish their role in the inception, design, and implementation of co-authored scholarly or creative work in a manner that indicates that the scholarly/creative activity is self-directed.

Community-based work resulting in Scholarship of Engagement is also a primary scholarly/creative indicator. Candidates who include products of Scholarship of Engagement in the primary scholarly/creative dossier are expected to frame accomplishments in terms of disciplinary relevance and community impact. They should, for example, use their scholarly/creative narrative to explain how the work draws on their disciplinary expertise, describe the co-creation and dissemination processes, address predicted or actual impact, and discuss why the work matters in disciplinary and community contexts. Appropriate documentation should accompany the narrative. Disciplinary relevance may be indicated by prizes, awards, publication of project-connected work, or other forms of recognition. To document community impact, candidates may include in their dossier unsolicited materials such as media reports. In consultation with the candidate, the Director of the School of Art will identify qualified community peer reviewers and invite them to provide assessments of impact. Assessments received from community peer reviewers will be included in the dossier. External reviewers for the tenure case, selected in accordance with University-wide guidelines, will be asked to evaluate both disciplinary relevance and community impact of the Scholarship of Engagement work, as appropriate to their background and expertise.

Secondary indicators for the effectiveness of scholarly/creative activity are recognized as contributing to disciplinary reputation but may not replace primary indicators. Secondary Indicators for Studio, Digital Arts and Graphic Design candidates might include:

- Significant presentations as a visiting artist/speaker
- Critical reviews of work by noted professional peers
- Competitive artist residencies
- Book/exhibition or catalog essays
- Works placed in permanent collections.

Secondary Indicators for Art Education and Art History candidates might include:

- Non-peer reviewed publications.
- Invited lecture and conference presentations.
- Keynote addresses
- Curation of exhibitions or non-peer reviewed publications.

c. Service - The standard allocation of service for TTF is 20%. Faculty perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough and timely manner. It is expected that TTF candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year. Specific examples of service might include:

1. Departmental, College or University committees as well as governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams, faculty jurying, unit preview days and studio/lab management.
2. Professional organizations connected to the discipline at the local, state, national and/or international levels.
3. Community service and external activities connected to the discipline that draw upon professional expertise.

Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to Professor requires an expanding record of achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and 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 domain substitute for its lack in another.

Rank qualifications and promotion eligibility for all BGSU faculty are addressed in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The School of Art-specific promotion criteria are as follows.

a. Teaching – The standard allocation of teaching for TTF is 40%. Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have a record of pedagogical innovation and leadership that might be demonstrated by creation of new courses, programs and peer mentoring. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes but is not limited to; positive student and peer evaluations, positive student written comments, course artifacts such as syllabi, course assessments, examples of assignments, presentations, labs, or student projects that show clear articulation of learning outcomes and student progress toward those outcomes, grants for teaching, curriculum development, letters of recognition, teaching awards or supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research. Specific criteria include:

1. Aggregate scores from student course evaluations should compare favorably with averages for similar courses in a given area and level taught by peer faculty (not graduate students). Written comments should be generally positive and not raise significant concerns over teaching.
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. Four peer evaluations during the review period that reflect teaching excellence.
4. Significant mentorship of undergraduates, including undergraduate research or internship supervision.
5. For faculty in graduate programs, the candidate should be active in the supervision and mentoring of graduate students.

b. Scholarly/creative activity - The standard allocation of scholarly/creative activity for TTF is 40%. Scholarly and creative activity is central to the mission of the School. Faculty candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate levels of quality and productivity commensurate with an established national or international reputation. The School of Art comprises different disciplines within the visual arts and the humanities (Studio Art, Graphic Design, Digital Arts, Art Education, Art History). Within each discipline further differences in trajectory and a corresponding range of quantity of accomplishments are employed to evaluate faculty scholarly/creative activity.

The following is an example list of primary indicators of scholarly/creative activity most relevant to faculty in each of the School's five divisions:

- Studio Division candidates will typically participate in 15 significant juried exhibitions or present 4 solo exhibitions to achieve promotion to Professor. Three major external grant awards with peer reviewed output would also be primary indicators of achievement and may count for up to 5 of the 15 juried exhibitions and one of the 4 solo exhibitions.
- Digital Arts Division candidates will typically participate in 15 significant juried exhibitions or present 4 solo exhibitions to achieve promotion to Professor. Alternatively, a digital arts faculty member typically will participate in 2 festival acceptance for feature length presentations or 10 festival acceptances for short animations including multiple screenings. Four major external grant awards with peer reviewed output would also be primary indicators of achievement and may count for up to 5 of the 15 juried exhibitions and one of the 4 solo exhibitions or one festival acceptance for feature length presentations and 3 festival acceptances for short animations.
- Graphic Design Division candidates will typically receive 6 art or design awards or undertake 6 significant design commissions to achieve promotion to Professor. Major external grants or scholarship of engagement projects are also primary indicators of achievement and are equivalent to design awards and commissions. Scholarship of engagement projects are affirmed through discipline-based acknowledgement and appropriate documentation of community impact (see below).
- Art Education Division candidates will typically publish one scholarly book or monograph or one edited volume plus 3 edited articles or 6 chapters in peer reviewed books or 6 articles in peer reviewed journals (including pedagogy) to achieve promotion to Professor. Significant external grants may substitute for up to 2 articles/chapters.
- Art History Division candidates will typically publish one scholarly book or monograph or one edited volume plus 3 edited articles or 6 chapters in peer reviewed books or 6 articles in peer

reviewed journals (including pedagogy), or 3 curated exhibitions at a national institution accompanied by a catalogue to achieve promotion to Professor. Significant external grants may substitute for up to 2 articles/chapters or for one curated exhibition at a national institution accompanied by a catalogue.

This list is illustrative and thus may not capture the full range of scholarly and creative activity undertaken by School of Art Faculty members. A candidate may present a dossier that combines product types, and some candidates may choose to work in both studio and scholarly domains. For all faculty members, however, expectations in terms of quality are the same. Although sustained productivity is valued, quantity cannot substitute for quality of contributions to the field or be considered as the sole criterion for evaluation. Quality is measured by eligible School of Art faculty members assessing the rigor of peer review and jurying, the prestige of exhibition/performance venues and the prestige of publications or publishers. Reviews written by external evaluators will also be an important component in assessing the disciplinary impact of the candidate's work. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate quality and a level of productivity commensurate with a national /international reputation.

Co-authored work is valued. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly establish their role in the inception, design, and implementation of co-authored scholarly or creative work in a manner that indicates that the scholarly/creative activity is self-directed.

Community-based work resulting in Scholarship of Engagement is also a primary scholarly/creative indicator. Candidates who include products of Scholarship of Engagement in the primary scholarly/creative dossier are expected to frame accomplishments in terms of disciplinary relevance and community impact. They should, for example, use their scholarly/creative activity narrative to explain how the work draws on their disciplinary expertise, describe the co-creation and dissemination processes, address predicted or actual impact, and discuss why the work matters in disciplinary and community contexts. Appropriate documentation should accompany the narrative. Disciplinary relevance may be indicated by prizes, awards, publication of project-connected work, or other forms of recognition. To document community impact, candidates may include in their dossier unsolicited materials such as media reports. In consultation with the candidate, the Director of the School of Art will identify qualified community peer reviewers and invite them to provide assessments of impact. Assessments received from community peer reviewers will be included in the dossier. External reviewers for the promotion case, selected in accordance with University-wide guidelines, will be asked to evaluate both disciplinary relevance and community impact of the Scholarship of Engagement work, as appropriate to their background and expertise.

Secondary indicators for the effectiveness of - scholarly/creative activity are recognized as contributing to disciplinary reputation but may not replace primary indicators. Secondary indicators for Studio, Digital Arts and Graphic Design candidates might include:
- Significant presentations as a visiting artist/speaker.
- Critical reviews of work by noted professional peers.
- Competitive artist residencies.
- Book/exhibition or catalog essays.
- Works placed in permanent collections.

Secondary Indicators for Art Education and Art History candidates might include:

- Non- peer reviewed publications.

- Invited lectures and presentations.
- Keynote addresses.
- Curation of exhibitions or non-peer reviewed publications.

d. Service - The standard allocation of service for TTF is 20%. Candidates applying for promotion to Professor are required to demonstrate service leadership. Service Leadership activity typically will include leading important initiatives resulting in improvements to and/or promotion of the School/College/ University's academic structure and culture, as well as leadership roles in community partnerships and professional organizations. Candidates perform service by assignment, election, or self-nomination. Service is evaluated by the degree to which responsibilities are performed in an effective, thorough, and timely manner. Successful candidates will serve on at least one committee or equivalent per year and, by the time of application for promotion to full professor will have engaged in at least two service leadership roles while an Associate Professor. Specific examples of service might include:

1. Chairing of Departmental, College or University committees as well as governing bodies, councils, special task forces and review teams.
2. Significant roles in professional organizations or editorial boards connected to the discipline at the national and/or international levels.
3. Impactful community leadership or collaboration and external activities connected to the discipline that draw upon professional expertise.

ACADEMIC UNIT PROCEDURES FOR CREATION AND SUBMISSION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION MATERIALS

PROCEDURES FOR CREATION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS
1. External reviews will be solicited according to the procedures specified by the Provost's Office.

2. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials to the University review system.

a. 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.

b. The dossier should consist of a current CV, student course evaluations for all courses taught since the date of hire or last promotion (which must include original quantitative student evaluation reports for each course taught in addition to the comparative quantitative summary, all of which are uploaded by the School Director), peer teaching evaluations, teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service narratives along with supporting materials for each narrative. Teaching support materials should include items such as sample syllabi and student work. Scholarly/creative activity   include articles, reproductions or other documentation from exhibitions. Service support materials should include evidence of service outcomes such as a listing of committee memberships and professional and community service activity.

Promotion to Professor

1. External reviews will be solicited according to the procedures specified by the Provost's Office.

2. Faculty member uploads the complete dossier consisting of a CV and supporting materials.

> a. 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.

> b. The dossier should consist of a current CV, student course evaluations for all courses taught since tenure (which must include original quantitative student evaluation reports for each course taught in addition to the comparative quantitative summary, all of which are uploaded by the School Director), peer teaching evaluations, teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service narratives along with supporting materials for each narrative.

Teaching support materials should include items such as sample syllabi and student work. Scholarly/creative activity   include articles, reproductions or other documentation from exhibitions. Service support materials should include evidence of service outcomes such as a listing of committee memberships and professional and community service activity.

Approved by the faculty of the School of Art   Date ____10-21-2024_____

Charles Kanwischer
Charles Kanwischer (Sep 18, 2025 09:55:36 EDT)   Date 09/18/2025
Charles Kanwischer
Director, School of Art

Approved: _____   Date 09/18/2025
Ellen Schendel
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Ravindra Krovi
Approved: Ravindra Krovi (Sep 21, 2025 14:38:41 EDT)   Date 09/21/2025
Ravi Krovi
Provost and Senior Vice President

approved CBA #5_rtp_soa.

Final Audit Report

2025-09-21

Created:	2025-09-18
By:	Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAt_xMmJ3-t_04akWo0hlhaD9ORVGBtghM
Number of Documents:	1
Document page count:	10
Number of supporting files:	0
Supporting files page count:	0

"approved CBA #5_rtp_soa." History

Document created by Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 12:55:17 PM GMT- IP address: 165.85.34.220

Document emailed to Edmond Kanwischer (ckanwis@bgsu.edu) for signature
2025-09-18 - 12:56:29 PM GMT

Email viewed by Edmond Kanwischer (ckanwis@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 1:54:39 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.193.213

Agreement viewed by Edmond Kanwischer (ckanwis@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 1:55:04 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.193.213

Signer Edmond Kanwischer (ckanwis@bgsu.edu) entered name at signing as Charles Kanwischer
2025-09-18 - 1:55:34 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.193.213

Document e-signed by Charles Kanwischer (ckanwis@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-09-18 - 1:55:36 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.193.213

Document emailed to Ellen Schendel (eschend@bgsu.edu) for signature
2025-09-18 - 1:55:38 PM GMT

Email viewed by Ellen Schendel (eschend@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 1:57:23 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.194.53

Agreement viewed by Ellen Schendel (eschend@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 7:03:10 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.194.189

Document e-signed by Ellen Schendel (eschend@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-09-18 - 7:03:22 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.194.189

Document emailed to Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu) for signature
2025-09-18 - 7:03:24 PM GMT

Email viewed by Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-18 - 7:03:58 PM GMT- IP address: 72.153.153.17

Reminder sent to Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-20 - 9:44:27 PM GMT

Email viewed by Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-21 - 7:22:33 AM GMT- IP address: 146.75.248.1

Agreement viewed by Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu)
2025-09-21 - 6:38:22 PM GMT- IP address: 165.85.34.220

Document e-signed by Ravindra Krovi (rkrovi@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-09-21 - 6:38:41 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 165.85.34.220

Agreement completed.
2025-09-21 - 6:38:41 PM GMT