

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS**  
**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICIES**

**General Comments about Evaluation of Faculty**

Pursuant to Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), bargaining unit faculty shall be advised by the Department Chair regarding specific assignment duties and the substantive standards and procedures used in decisions for reappointment (based upon annual performance reviews and enhanced performance reviews), promotion, and tenure. Any additional expectations used by the Department shall be brought to the attention of the faculty members, and written copies of these additional expectations shall be readily available upon request. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.1, 6.1.1)

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders shall have a written success plan for the professional development of each NTTF and probationary TTF. The Department Chair shall communicate with the NTTF member to foster achievement and effectiveness in the areas of the NTTF member's assigned responsibilities. Similarly, the Department Chair shall communicate with the probationary tenure-track faculty member to foster achievement and effectiveness in all areas of teaching, service, and research. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.2, 6.1.2)

The Department Chair shall provide reasonable advanced notification of upcoming unit, college, or university schedules or deadlines for reappointment, annual performance reviews, enhanced performance reviews, tenure, or promotion. (Art. 14, sec. 5.1.3, 6.1.3)

**Reappointment Policy: NTTF**

**A. Policy Development**

Non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members shall be reviewed annually for reappointment, in the form of either an annual performance review (APR) or an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with this reappointment policy. The decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of current and previous annual performance reviews (APRs) and/or enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), with emphasis on continuity of favorable performance or a clear record of improved performance. (5.2.1)

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders shall have established written policies for annual reappointment of NTTF members regarding: (1) the criteria used for annual performance reviews (APRs) and enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), (2) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews, and (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining

Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the reappointment review. (5.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and the Chair, subject to endorsement of the Dean. (5.2.2.2)

**B. Criteria used for Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews of NTTF**

Most NTTF have a primary allocation of effort to teaching with additional expectation of service. Evaluation of NTTF will be done in accordance with their assigned workload. Criteria for review of teaching, research, and service, are listed in Appendix B.

All NTTF are required to submit a portfolio annually for the APR and every third year for the EPR; the portfolio for the EPR will have additional materials required. See below procedure for details on documenting teaching, research (if applicable), and service in the annual and third year portfolios.

***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR APR AND EPR EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR NTTF:***

**1) Teaching activities that NTTF may engage in (not all activities would be engaged in by all NTTF).** *The evaluation of teaching will consider an overall profile of the NTTF member's teaching assignments, as well as any additional activities documented in the teaching portfolio as evidence of teaching performance.*

***Classroom instruction:***

- lecture courses (1000-7000 level)
- seminars, special topics classes, workshops
- laboratory instruction

***Non-classroom instruction:***

- direct clinical instruction (clinical supervision)
- engagement/outreach activities such as service learning
- directed studies or research for undergraduate students
- directed studies or research for graduate students
- direction of undergraduate senior or honors projects
- participation on graduate thesis/dissertation committees (if appropriate ad hoc graduate faculty status is sought and obtained)

***Curriculum/teaching enhancement activities***

- guest-lecturing in existing departmental courses and courses in other University departments
- developing new departmental course offerings

- participating in workshops, programs, or evaluation procedures devoted to improving teaching effectiveness
- maintaining clinical certification through appropriate continuing education

## **2) Teaching Portfolios:**

A portfolio documenting successful teaching must be submitted by faculty under review. Indicators of teaching performance include, but are not limited to, the below-listed domains. A pattern of successful performance is expected to be demonstrated across the domains for reappointment; teaching will not be evaluated solely on the basis of student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

For the Annual Review, the teaching portfolio for NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Teaching philosophy.
- A list of courses taught with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, information on the clinical assignment must be provided, including at a minimum numbers of students supervised, and nature of clinical assignment, whether assessment, intervention, or consultation.
- A list of other instructional activities, if any.
- Student ratings of teaching effectiveness, quantitative and qualitative, for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, during the preceding 12 months.
- Self reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings, peer feedback, if applicable, and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.
- For faculty with a clinical teaching assignment, documentation of continuing education and how it pertains to the faculty member's clinical teaching.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their teaching effectiveness.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the teaching portfolio of NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Teaching philosophy.
- A list of courses taught with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
- A list of other instructional activities.
- Peer evaluations.
- Student ratings of teaching effectiveness, quantitative and qualitative, for all courses taught and for any clinical teaching assignments, during the preceding three years.
- Quality indicators for non-classroom teaching activities (e.g., student awards, successful project completion, etc.)
- Self-reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.
- Documentation of teaching improvement efforts.
- For faculty with a clinical teaching assignment, documentation of continuing education and how it pertains to the faculty member's clinical teaching.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their teaching effectiveness.

The teaching portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

In addition to materials submitted in the teaching portfolio, evaluation will also consider whether the faculty member adheres to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting his/her responsibilities to students, including but not limited to the following:

- Faculty member is available to students, at a minimum holding regular weekly office hours, and making accommodations to meet with students at other times, as needed and within reason. Legitimate student requests for assistance during regular business hours are attended to within a reasonable span of time (48 hours). The faculty member monitors email, voice mail, and on-line course management software regularly.
- The faculty member complies with university policies, including equal access for individuals with disabilities and academic honesty.
- The faculty member provides feedback on student performance on a regular basis (for class teaching, at least once within a 4 week span either qualitative or quantitative feedback on class performance is provided; for clinical teaching, weekly feedback, written and/or oral, is provided).

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

### ***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR APR AND EPR EVALUATION OF SERVICE FOR NTTF:***

In general, “service” refers to making significant contributions to the governance and operation of the Department, College, University, and the profession, through participation in local, state, national, and international professional organizations. Additionally, direct assistance to the local community through consultative service and outreach is a recognized and valued type of service provided by faculty. Service duties included for consideration for evaluation purposes must have some relation to a faculty member’s professional roles.

#### **Types of service activities:**

Service activities that NTTF may engage in (not all NTTF will be involved in all activities), include, but are not limited to:

Service activities for the Department, College, and University:

- Service as chair or member on Departmental committees
- Service as chair or member on College and University committees
- Service to the clinic, including participation in marketing efforts
- Participation in departmental and clinic decision-making and policy formation

- Interdisciplinary service activities such as provision of consultative or clinical services to other departments and interdisciplinary programs, informative workshops and lectures, etc.
- Advising of professionally related student organizations

Service activities for the professions:

- Participation in the governance of state, national, and international professional organizations
- Chair or member of boards or committees of state and national professional organizations
- Editing and reviewing for scholarly journals
- Elected officer of professional societies
- Accreditation site visit teams for professional organizations or external review teams for universities and colleges
- Reviewing for private or government grants competitions
- Continuing education lectures

Service activities for the external community:

- clinical outreach service
- provision of clinical services to the community via the Department's speech, language, and hearing clinics
- community health fairs
- consultation with school personnel
- technical assistance to schools, health care facilities, state institutions, etc.
- consultations with physicians or other professionals
- consumer education, via such avenues as community lectures; media interviews; answering inquiries from the public
- service to consumer advocacy organizations and support groups for those with communication disorders

**Procedures for Evaluation of Service for NTTF:**

Faculty members undergoing Performance Review must prepare a service portfolio for review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee as well as the Chair. The portfolio must be updated annually.

For the Annual Review, the service portfolio for NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Service philosophy.
- A list of service activities for the past 12 months, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the service portfolio of NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Service philosophy.
- A list of service activities for the past three years, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals and progress towards them over the three year period.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

The service portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

### ***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR APR AND EPR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP FOR NTTF:***

In general, the domain of “research and scholarship” includes designing and implementing research and disseminating research findings. Examples of research and other creative endeavors include: articles in peer-reviewed journals; developing grant proposals for submission to external funding agencies; books; book chapters; monographs; presentations to professional societies; development of intellectual property (copyrights, patents, trademarks, or tangible research) with possible commercialization; development of professional resources/materials, which might include (but not be limited to) such activities as continuing education presentations for a clinical audience, or development of published clinical resources for assessment and/or intervention.

Faculty members may engage in a range of scholarly and professional activities that result in products such as those listed above. In accord with the standards of scholarly work prevalent in our discipline, articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals are given strong emphasis in assessing the overall productivity of a faculty member’s scholarship. Receipt of funding from external agencies is also an indicator of highly respected scholarly productivity and quality. Scholarly books and book chapters that receive peer review would also be strong indicators of scholarly success/quality. Inventions and patents, licensing, and commercialization of the fruits of scholarly efforts are significant quality indicators.

#### **Types of activities:**

- Designing and Implementing Research and Other Creative Works
  - Funding: Actively pursues support from private, University-level, state, and national funding sources. Funding proposals include: preparation, submission, and approval of the requests.

- *Examples:* research projects, training grants, equipment grants, external contracts
  -
- Development/preparation of external research settings: Engaged with external sites/partners to gain access to appropriate research populations and/or settings and/or equipment to carry out planned research program.
  - *Examples:* identifying and developing successful relationship with data collection site
- Development and maintenance of a research laboratory: uses start-up funds and any other available sources to set up and run a functional laboratory appropriate to faculty member's research plans.
  - *Examples:* reviews needed equipment choices; completes needed purchases during the start-up period; completes needed training in use of equipment; develops overall functional lab with staff trained to use it
- Recruiting, training & supervising research assistants.
  - *Examples:* recruits master's and doctoral students who are able to work in the lab; recruits undergraduate volunteers; trains GA's in research protocols
- Development of collaborations, such as those with departmental colleagues, university colleagues, and colleagues external to the university in order to co-prepare research proposals, co-author research papers and presentations, and develop and maintain external and/or internal research programs.
  - *Examples:* Liaisons established with other departments or institutions
- Dissemination of Research and Other Creative Works
  - *Examples:*
    - Publication of research articles and abstracts in peer-reviewed journals
    - Dissemination of creative works other than original research
    - Presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional)
    - Invited lectures and keynotes (international, national, regional)
- Intellectual property and commercialization
  - *Examples:*
    - Inventions
    - Patents
    - Commercialization

**Procedures for Evaluation of Research for NTTF:**

For the Annual Review, the research portfolio for NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Research statement.
- A list of research activities for the past 12 months, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of research activities for the year, including annual goals.
- Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their research effectiveness.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the research portfolio of NTTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Research statement.
- A list of research activities for the past three years, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of research activities, including annual goals and progress towards them over the three year period.
- Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their research effectiveness.

The research portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

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

#### C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

Department faculty may amend this reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair and Dean, to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to NTTF members during existing multiple year terms of annually renewable contracts. (5.2.2.3)

#### D. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of NTTF (Art. 14, sec. 5.2.3)

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with this reappointment policy. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The written recommendation of the Chair shall be submitted to the Dean and the Provost/VPAA.
3. Prior to submitting the written recommendation to the Dean, the Chair shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the recommendation. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
4. The unit's written recommendation regarding reappointment shall be submitted to the Dean. The decision regarding reappointment shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.3 of the CBA.



- E. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of NTTF (Art. 14, sec. 5.2.4).
1. Non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who have received appointments for three (3) consecutive years shall be subject to an Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) during the third year of appointment before an additional appointment can be authorized.
  2. Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials: a portfolio documenting teaching, service, and, research/scholarship (if applicable). Appendix A provides general instructions for preparation of credentials. A more specific list of supporting materials is included above in section B.

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

3. Initial responsibility for applying established criteria of the Department’s reappointment policy and making recommendations regarding reappointment following an Enhanced Performance Review rests with the tenured, probationary tenure-track, and non-tenure track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department who are above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, who shall make a written recommendation to the Department Chair.
4. The Chair shall submit the written recommendations of the Department faculty to the Dean, accompanied by his/her own written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty’s recommendation. If the Chair disagrees with the recommendation of the unit faculty, then he/she shall state the reasons for his/her disagreement in writing.
5. Prior to submitting the Department’s recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the unit faculty and the recommendation from the Chair, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
6. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the Department/Chair, the Chair’s recommendation, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the faculty of the Department, the Chair’s recommendation, and the college-level review committee’s recommendations to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean’s submission of materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.

7. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or nonrenewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
8. The decision to reappoint the faculty member, upon the completion of the Enhanced Performance Review, shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.3 of the CBA.
9. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the academic unit, the Chair, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the VPAA determines that a non-tenure track faculty member is not performing satisfactorily, the University shall give written notice of its intention to nonrenew the employment of the affected Bargaining Unit Faculty Member and the reasons for the decision to nonrenew shall be specified, with a copy sent to the BGSU-FA.

### **Promotion Policy: NTTF**

#### **A. Eligibility**

Promotion in rank is based upon performance. A non-tenure-track faculty member may request an evaluation for promotion based upon: (1) the criteria for such rank (Article 14, section 3 of the CBA), (2) academic unit policies, and (3) the academic achievements of the NTTF member.

Instructors are eligible to be promoted to Lecturer after six years of experience as a full-time faculty member at BGSU (section 3.2.2.2) and two successful Enhanced Performance Reviews (section 5.2.4). However, based upon exceptional performance or achievement, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member, at the discretion of the administration, may have the opportunity to apply for promotion prior to six (6) years.

Lecturers are eligible to be promoted to Senior Lecturer typically after six years of experience as a Lecturer at BGSU (section 3.2.3.2) and two successful Enhanced Performance Reviews as a Lecturer (section 5.2.4).

#### **B. Policy Development**

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders shall have established written policies for promotion of NTTF members regarding: (1) the criteria used for evaluation, (2) the process for conducting and completing the evaluation for promotion, (3) the schedule or deadlines necessary for completing the evaluation and, (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the promotion process. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (5.3.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the reviews lies with the Bargaining Unit faculty members of the academic unit and the Chair, subject to endorsement of the Dean. (5.3.2.2)

### C. Criteria used for Promotion Reviews of NTTF

#### 1. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Promotion for the nontenure track candidates will be determined on the basis of a portfolio demonstrating accomplishments that show professional growth and excellence in job performance. These materials can be developed based on those submitted for annual and enhanced performance reviews. Per the guidelines set forth in the CBA and established here by the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, a minimum criterion for consideration for promotion is an overall yearly APR evaluation of meets expectations, with at least one of the three years being rated as exceeds expectations as defined in the Reappointment Policy: NTTF for each of the prior three (3) years and the completion of two (2) successful Enhanced Performance Reviews as instructor. In addition, candidates for promotion must demonstrate via their portfolio that their performance warrants promotion, including performance that meets expectations in all aspects of their job, and continued overall growth and development.

#### 2. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Promotion for the nontenure track candidates will be determined on the basis of a portfolio demonstrating accomplishments that show professional growth and excellence in job performance. These materials can be developed based on those submitted for annual and enhanced performance reviews. For promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, the NTTF candidate would need to receive an overall yearly APR evaluation of “meets (or exceeds) expectations” as defined in the Reappointment Policy: NTTF for each of the prior three (3) years and the completion of two (2) successful Enhanced Performance Reviews as Lecturer. In addition, candidates for promotion must demonstrate via their portfolio that their performance warrants promotion: including performance that maintains the lecturer criteria and exceeds expectations in all areas for at least three of the last five years including the most recent year, and continued overall growth and development.

### D. Amendment and Retroactive Application

Department faculty may amend this promotion policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair and Dean, to be applied to subsequent reappointment reviews. However, changes in the criteria for promotion may not be applied retroactively to NTTF members during existing multiple year terms of annually renewable contracts. (5.3.2.3)

### E. Process for Creation and Submission of Promotion Materials

The NTTF requesting promotion are required to notify the Department by July 1 of their intent to submit materials in support of the promotion application. The due date for the promotional materials will be determined according to the timelines required by the Office of the Provost and will be transmitted to the NTTF member in sufficient time to complete the materials. NTTF are required to submit a portfolio documenting their teaching, service, and, if applicable, research/scholarship, following current university guidelines for submission of promotion portfolios. Information to be included must at minimum follow the same guidelines as for EPRs in terms of content. Years covered should include information from date of hire or last promotion, whichever is later. Note that in most cases the NTTF member will not have assignments that include research and, thus, are not required to include that material in the submitted materials. NTTF involved in research without formal allocation of effort may submit research/scholarship information as evidence of performance that may positively affect promotion evaluations.

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

**F. Process for Evaluation of NTTF Promotion Request (Art. 14, sec. 5.3.3)**

1. A request by a NTTF member for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the Department.
  - a. The Department's eligible voters for a non-tenure-track faculty member applying for promotion shall consist of all tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department and all non-tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of higher rank in the Department.
  - b. If the Department has fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members holding rank higher than the applicant for promotion, from related disciplines outside the Department, with the consent of the Department's voting eligible faculty and the Chair. Such appointments will be made so as to maintain the integrity of the discipline.
2. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding promotion rests with the Department's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Chair.
3. The Chair shall submit to the Dean the written recommendation of the academic unit's eligible voters accompanied by his/her own written statement agreeing or disagreeing with the unit faculty's recommendation. If the Chair disagrees with the unit's recommendation, then he/she shall state his/her reasons for the disagreement in writing

4. Prior to submitting the Department's recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the NTTF member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the Department faculty and the recommendation from the Chair, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
5. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the faculty of the Department, the Chair's recommendation, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the faculty of the academic unit, the Chair's recommendation, and the college-level review committee's recommendations to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the NTTF member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
6. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending promotion to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
7. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the faculty member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. The faculty member has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing his or her Chair, Dean, and Provost/VPAA, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has exercised his or her right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for promotion.
8. An affirmative vote of a majority of the academic unit's eligible voters (as defined in 5.3.3.1.1 of the CBA) shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Bargaining Unit Faculty Members eligible to vote have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters 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.

### **Reappointment Policy: TTF**

#### **A. Policy Development**

Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed annually in the form of either an annual performance review (APR), or for reappointment in an enhanced performance review (EPR), in accordance with the academic unit's reappointment policy. The decision to positively/negatively recommend reappointment shall be based primarily on the content of

current and previous annual performance reviews (APRs) and/or enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), with emphasis on satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion (if applicable). (6.2.1)

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders shall have established written policies for reappointment of probationary faculty members regarding: (1) the criteria used for annual performance reviews (APRs) and enhanced performance reviews (EPRs), (2) the process for conducting and completing either of these types of reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing reviews and, (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the reappointment review. (6.2.2.1)

The responsibility for establishing criteria and procedures for evaluation and for conducting the annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty members lies with the tenured and tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and the Chair, subject to the endorsement of the Dean. (6.2.2.2)

**B. Criteria used for Annual Performance Reviews and Enhanced Performance Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty**

Criteria for review of teaching, research, and service, are listed in Appendix B.

All TTF are required to submit a portfolio annually for the APR and every third year for the EPR; the portfolio for the EPR will have additional materials required. See below section on documenting teaching, research, and service in the annual and third year portfolios.

Tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who have received appointments for three (3) consecutive years shall be subject to an Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) during the third year of appointment before an additional appointment can be authorized.

Enhanced Performance Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and a portfolio documenting teaching, service, and research/scholarship. TTF will submit their portfolios for review according to the timelines established by the Provost's office. Faculty will submit their portfolios following university guidelines/systems. The portfolios will be disseminated using the university's system to the chair of the department evaluation committee, who will coordinate the review to be completed by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty members in the unit. Per the guidelines laid out in the CBA, Article 14, Sections 5.2.3, the EPR shall result in a written evaluation and recommendation regarding reappointment from the tenured faculty in the department.

***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR EPR EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR TTF:***

**1) Teaching activities that TTF may engage in (not all activities would be engaged in by all TTF).** *The evaluation of teaching will consider an overall profile of the TTF member's teaching assignments, as well as any additional activities documented in the teaching portfolio as evidence of teaching performance.*

***Classroom instruction:***

- lecture courses (1000-7000 level)
- seminars, special topics classes, workshops
- laboratory instruction

***Non-classroom instruction:***

- direct clinical instruction (clinical supervision)
- engagement/outreach activities such as service learning
- directed studies or research for undergraduate students
- directed studies or research for graduate students
- direction of undergraduate senior or honors projects
- participation on graduate thesis/dissertation committees (if appropriate ad hoc graduate faculty status is sought and obtained)

***Curriculum/teaching enhancement activities***

- guest-lecturing in existing departmental courses and courses in other University departments
- developing new departmental course offerings
- participating in workshops, programs, or evaluation procedures devoted to improving teaching effectiveness
- maintaining clinical certification through appropriate continuing education

**2) Teaching Portfolios:**

A portfolio documenting successful teaching must be submitted by faculty under review. Indicators of teaching performance include, but are not limited to, the below-listed domains. A pattern of successful performance is expected to be demonstrated across the domains for reappointment; teaching will not be evaluated solely on the basis of student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

For the Annual Review, the teaching portfolio for TTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Teaching philosophy.
- A list of courses taught with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, information on the clinical assignment must be provided, including at a minimum numbers of students supervised, and nature of clinical assignment, whether assessment, intervention, or consultation.
- A list of other instructional activities, if any.

- Student ratings of teaching effectiveness, quantitative and qualitative, for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, during the preceding 12 months.
- Self reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings, peer feedback, if applicable, and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.
- For faculty with a clinical teaching assignment, documentation of continuing education and how it pertains to the faculty member's clinical teaching.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their teaching effectiveness.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the teaching portfolio of TTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Teaching philosophy.
- A list of courses taught with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
- A list of other instructional activities.
- Peer evaluations.
- Student ratings of teaching effectiveness, quantitative and qualitative, for all courses taught and for any clinical teaching assignments, during the preceding three years.
- Quality indicators for non-classroom teaching activities (e.g., student awards, successful project completion, etc.)
- Self-reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.
- Documentation of teaching improvement efforts.
- For faculty with a clinical teaching assignment, documentation of continuing education and how it pertains to the faculty member's clinical teaching.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their teaching effectiveness.

The teaching portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

In addition to materials submitted in the teaching portfolio, evaluation will also consider whether the faculty member adheres to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting his/her responsibilities to students, including but not limited to the following:

- Faculty member is available to students, at a minimum holding regular weekly office hours, and making accommodations to meet with students at other times, as needed and within reason. Legitimate student requests for assistance during regular business hours are attended to within a reasonable span of time (48 hours). The faculty member monitors email, voice mail, and on-line course management software regularly.
- The faculty member complies with university policies, including equal access for individuals with disabilities and academic honesty.
- The faculty member provides feedback on student performance on a regular basis (for class teaching, at least once within a 4 week span either qualitative



or quantitative feedback on class performance is provided; for clinical teaching, weekly feedback, written and/or oral, is provided).

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

### ***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR EPR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP FOR TTF:***

In general, the domain of “research and scholarship” includes designing and implementing research and disseminating research findings. Examples of research and other creative endeavors include: articles in peer-reviewed journals; developing grant proposals for submission to external funding agencies; books; book chapters; monographs; presentations to professional societies; development of intellectual property (copyrights, patents, trademarks, or tangible research) with possible commercialization; development of professional resources/materials, which might include (but not be limited to) such activities as continuing education presentations for a clinical audience, or development of published clinical resources for assessment and/or intervention.

Faculty members may engage in a range of scholarly and professional activities that result in products such as those listed above. In accord with the standards of scholarly work prevalent in our discipline, articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals are given strong emphasis in assessing the overall productivity of a faculty member’s scholarship. Receipt of funding from external agencies is also an indicator of highly respected scholarly productivity and quality. Scholarly books and book chapters that receive peer review would also be strong indicators of scholarly success/quality. Inventions and patents, licensing, and commercialization of the fruits of scholarly efforts are significant quality indicators.

#### **Examples of activities:**

- Designing and Implementing Research and Other Creative Works
  - Funding: Actively pursues support from private, University-level, state, and national funding sources. Funding proposals include: preparation, submission, and approval of the requests.
    - *Examples:* research projects, training grants, equipment grants, external contracts
      -

- Development/preparation of external research settings: Engaged with external sites/partners to gain access to appropriate research populations and/or settings and/or equipment to carry out planned research program.
  - *Examples:* identifying and developing successful relationship with data collection site
- Development and maintenance of a research laboratory: uses start-up funds and any other available sources to set up and run a functional laboratory appropriate to faculty member's research plans.
  - *Examples:* reviews needed equipment choices; completes needed purchases during the start-up period; completes needed training in use of equipment; develops overall functional lab with staff trained to use it
- Recruiting, training & supervising research assistants.
  - *Examples:* recruits master's and doctoral students who are able to work in the lab; recruits undergraduate volunteers; trains GA's in research protocols
- Development of collaborations, such as those with departmental colleagues, university colleagues, and colleagues external to the university in order to co-prepare research proposals, co-author research papers and presentations, and develop and maintain external and/or internal research programs.
  - *Examples:* Liaisons established with other departments or institutions
- Dissemination of Research and Other Creative Works
  - *Examples:*
    - Publication of research articles and abstracts in peer-reviewed journals
    - Dissemination of creative works other than original research
    - Presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional)
    - Invited lectures and keynotes (international, national, regional)
- Intellectual property and commercialization
  - *Examples:*
    - Inventions
    - Patents
    - Commercialization

### **Procedures for Evaluation of Research for TTF:**

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the research portfolio of TTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Research statement.
- A list of research activities for the past three years, as defined above.

- Self reflection/analysis of research activities, including annual goals and progress towards them over the three year period.
- Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their research effectiveness.

The research portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of “meets expectations” per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

### ***SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR EPR EVALUATION OF SERVICE FOR TTF:***

In general, “service” refers to making significant contributions to the governance and operation of the Department, College, University, and the profession, through participation in local, state, national, and international professional organizations. Additionally, direct assistance to the local community through consultative service and outreach is a recognized and valued type of service provided by faculty. Service duties included for consideration for evaluation purposes must have some relation to a faculty member’s professional roles.

#### **Types of service activities:**

Service activities that TTF may engage in (not all TTF will be involved in all activities), include, but are not limited to:

#### **Service activities for the Department, College, and University:**

- Service as chair or member on Departmental committees
- Service as chair or member on College and University committees
- Service to the clinic, including participation in marketing efforts
- Participation in departmental and clinic decision-making and policy formation
- Interdisciplinary service activities such as provision of consultative or clinical services to other departments and interdisciplinary programs, informative workshops and lectures, etc.
- Advising of professionally related student organizations

#### **Service activities for the professions:**

- Participation in the governance of state, national, and international professional organizations
- Chair or member of boards or committees of state and national professional organizations
- Editing and reviewing for scholarly journals
- Elected officer of professional societies
- Accreditation site visit teams for professional organizations or external review teams for universities and colleges
- Reviewing for private or government grants competitions
- Continuing education lectures

Service activities for the external community:

- clinical outreach service
- provision of clinical services to the community via the Department's speech, language, and hearing clinics
- community health fairs
- consultation with school personnel
- technical assistance to schools, health care facilities, state institutions, etc.
- consultations with physicians or other professionals
- consumer education, via such avenues as community lectures; media interviews; answering inquiries from the public
- service to consumer advocacy organizations and support groups for those with communication disorders

**Procedures for Evaluation of Service for TTF:**

Faculty members undergoing Performance Review must prepare a service portfolio for review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee as well as the Chair. The portfolio must be updated annually.

For the Annual Review, the service portfolio for TTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Service philosophy.
- A list of service activities for the past 12 months, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the service portfolio of TTF must include at a minimum the following elements:

- Service philosophy.
- A list of service activities for the past three years, as defined above.
- Self reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals and progress towards them over the three year period.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

The service portfolio will be evaluated using the rubric in Appendix B.

For the Annual Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of "meets expectations" per the rubrics in Appendix B as applied to the portfolio submitted.

For the Enhanced Performance Review, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of "meets expectations" per the rubrics in Appendix B, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

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

### C. Amendment and Retroactive Application

Department faculty may amend the unit's reappointment policy at any time, with the concurrence of the Chair and Dean. However, such changes may not be applied retroactively to probationary tenure-track faculty during their probationary period. (6.2.2.3)

### D. Procedure for Annual Performance Review (APR) of TTF (Art. 14, sec. 6.2.3)

1. Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with this reappointment policy. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, service, and librarian effectiveness (if applicable). In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not be the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
2. The review shall be submitted in writing to the Dean and to the Provost/VPAA. Included in the review shall be a statement indicating whether sufficient progress is being made toward tenure and/or promotion.
3. Prior to submitting the unit's written recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with a written copy of the recommendation, and discuss the content of the unit's recommendation. In response, the probationary tenure track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.

### E. Procedure for Enhanced Performance Review (EPR) of TTF (Art. 14, sec. 6.2.4)

1. Probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be given an enhanced performance review at the mid-point of their probationary period. The mid-probationary enhanced performance review shall normally occur during the third year of a probationary appointment. However, in cases where a faculty member has received prior service credit (see Art. 14, section 2.2.1.6 of the CBA), the review shall occur at a time agreed upon by the appointee and the Provost/VPAA.
2. Mid-probationary enhanced performance reviews shall be conducted by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the Department/School. The review shall evaluate the probationary tenure-track faculty member's progress in teaching, research or creative work, service, and librarian effectiveness (where applicable). In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. The Department faculty's recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the Department Chair.
3. The Department Chair shall submit the recommendation of the unit faculty to the Dean accompanied by a written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation. If the Chair disagrees with the unit faculty's recommendation, he/she should state the reasons for disagreement in writing.

4. Prior to submitting the Department's recommendation to the Dean, the Department Chair shall meet with the probationary tenure-track faculty member, provide him/her with copies of the written recommendation from the Department faculty and the recommendation from the Chair, and discuss the content of the recommendations. In response, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
5. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the Department faculty, Chair, and the recommendation of the college-level review committee. The Dean shall then forward his/her recommendation, along with the written recommendations of the Department faculty, the Chair, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the probationary tenure-track faculty member may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of the meeting.
6. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending reappointment or non-renewal to the President. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
7. If, after considering the progress recommendations from the Department faculty, the Chair, the college-level review committee, and the Dean, the Provost/VPAA determines that a probationary tenure-track faculty member is not making reasonable progress toward tenure, the University shall give written notice of its intention to non-renew the employment of the affected probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member, and a copy of the notification is sent to the BGSU-FA.
8. A probationary tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who fails to obtain a recommendation for reappointment at the end of the mid-probationary review shall receive a one (1) year terminal appointment at the end of which time, the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member shall be terminated from employment at BGSU.

### **Tenure and Promotion Policy: TTF**

#### **A. Standards for Tenure (Art. 14, sec. 6.3)**

1. The probationary tenure-track faculty candidate for tenure who has adhered to professional standards of ethics, the Ohio Code of Ethics Law, and appropriate professional codes of ethics, shall be granted or denied tenure solely on the basis of the following criteria: attainment of the terminal degree or its professional equivalent, teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative work, librarian effectiveness (where applicable), and service to the University community or profession. (6.3.1)

2. More precise statements of criteria for teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, and service used for the granting or denial of tenure may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA. (6.3.2)

CDIS faculty applying for tenure must submit a portfolio documenting their teaching, research and service during their time at BGSU. Elements to be included are listed above under APR/EPR guidelines; required elements are outlined in Appendix A. Candidates for tenure must submit evidence documenting that they meet the following standards:

- APR and EPR reviews meeting expectations. If any reviews indicated areas considered problematic for tenure, the tenure portfolio must address these concerns by describing progress in that area.
- A record of successful teaching as documented in the teaching portfolio, including evidence of teaching effectiveness judged at least to “meet expectations” overall.
- A record of successful service as documented in the service portfolio, including evidence of service judged at least to “meet expectations” overall.
- Evidence of emerging national reputation in the discipline. A major indicator of such a reputation is positive letters reviewing research and scholarship by external referees. See Section D below for guidelines for soliciting external letters of support. In addition to external letters, the candidate’s credentials must include a research portfolio. As part of that portfolio, other indicators of national reputation may be submitted by the candidate for consideration, including but not limited to such evidence as:
  - Invited national/international keynote presentations
  - Requests to serve in scholarly service roles with national/international visibility (e.g., editorial boards, scholarly review committees, peer reviewing, etc.)
  - Citation indices for publications and selectivity ratings of journals in which the scholar has published
  - Number of peer-reviewed publications and presentations in national and international outlets
- A record of conducting and disseminating the results of scholarly work. The faculty member must have a substantive record of publications in peer reviewed outlets. The department recognizes and supports all forms of research (e.g., empirical and theoretical, quantitative and qualitative). In addition, a regular history of submission of work for peer review is required for tenure. The faculty of CDIS will consider the following in determining adequacy:
  - Publication record. Typically, 4-6 publications in well-respected outlets are expected. The review will take into account both the quantity and overall quality of publications. The concept of a substantive record is predicated on a consistent output—an average of 1 unique manuscript submission annually. Quality indicators include: rigor of peer reviewed outlets as measured by such standards as percent acceptance and/or reputation in the discipline; impact of articles, as measured by citation indices or other evidence of impact; other evidence, such as editor’s awards.

- Regular dissemination of research at national and international venues. Annual presentation of research at national and/or international conferences is generally expected; exceptions should be noted and explained in the portfolio.
- Any other evidence of quality scholarly work.
  - E.g., evidence of successful commercialization and technology transfer efforts.
- Activity seeking external funding to support research. Specific dollar amounts of external funds are not required, and it is possible to be tenured with no external funding, if the faculty member's research program is successful without such funding. Grant funding alone will not offset a weak publication record. Faculty members are expected to seek external support as appropriate to their research needs. At least one external grant proposal is expected to have been submitted during the years on the tenure track. If a faculty member's first attempt is not successful, then more than one attempt is encouraged. In judging the record, the question to be answered will be whether or not the faculty member was diligent in seeking appropriate support for his or her research. Evidence of diligence includes both grant success as measured by dollars awarded, as well as an active history of submitting external proposals, use of internal support mechanisms to develop an externally fundable line of work, participation in grant mentoring activities such as workshops and mentor-mentee matching programs; other partnerships with individuals with success in externally funded programs of research, etc..
- Evidence of successful mentorship of students in research. Examples of activities include mentoring undergraduate research and honors projects, participating in master's and doctoral committees, serving as a research mentor to a doctoral student, and supervision of master's theses and (in rare cases) doctoral dissertations. Quality indicators include co-authored publications and presentations with students, and student success in projects, theses, and dissertations as evidenced by graduation rates, awards, and presentations.

#### B. Standards for Promotion (Art. 14, sec. 6.4)

1. Promotion in rank for tenure-track and tenured faculty members is based upon performance. Any faculty member may perform satisfactorily at a given academic rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher one. It also is recognized that a period of time will elapse after a promotion, during which time further promotion is not normally to be expected. A faculty member may request a promotion review in accordance with established deadlines set by the Provost/VPAA's office. In addition, faculty members whose performance merits consideration for promotion may be invited by the Chair to submit credentials for promotion review. (6.4.1)
2. The criteria for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are set forth in Article 14, Section 3. More precise statements of what is expected for promotion under teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, service, may be specified by the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the Department. All such statements must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost/VPAA.



3. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. All candidates seeking promotion must meet criteria for tenure. Candidates eligible for tenure will be deemed eligible for promotion. See above for criteria.
4. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
  - All candidates seeking promotion must meet criteria for tenure if tenure has not already been conferred.
  - Candidates for promotion to full professor should demonstrate a record of effective teaching, at a level that has continued to meet the above criteria for effective teaching described under the promotion to associate.
  - A national reputation for scholarly work should have emerged from the research record. The department recognizes and supports all forms of research (e.g., empirical and theoretical, quantitative and qualitative). Each of the following elements must be documented in the portfolio:
    - A substantial publication record in high quality peer reviewed archival journals, and other scholarly outlets. Typically faculty members being promoted to professor should have been publishing regularly across their careers. In addition, there is an expectation of at least 6 publications over the course of the most recent 6 years.
    - Regular presentation record at state, national and/or international meetings (an average of at least one such annually for the most recent 6 years)
    - Invited presentations at state, national, and international meetings
    - External funding attempts are required but securing funding is not.
    - Favorable supporting statements made by external reviewers who have been requested to review the credentials of the candidate for promotion to professor (see below section D on external referee selection process). Note that in the case of disagreement among reviewers, an overall qualitative evaluation of whether this standard is met must be made; the presence of one or more unfavorable statements would not automatically result in a negative overall judgment. Thus evaluation will be based on a global judgment of the reviewers' statements.
  - A record of service to the department, college, university, and the profession must be demonstrated throughout the most recent 6 years.
  - The following additional indicators may be considered in instances where a candidate's record approaches but does not completely meet one of the above criteria in quantity or quality (for example, 5 publications in the last 6 years):
    - An externally funded research program
    - Acting as a consultant for other researchers
    - A national reputation for professional and scholarly service
    - Recognition of excellence in teaching

- Success at guiding students in their research endeavors
- Successful commercialization and technology transfer activities.
- Any other evidence the candidate wishes to submit to support the application for promotion

### C. Policy Development

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders shall have written policies for tenure and promotion for TTF members, regarding: (1) the criteria used for tenure and promotion, (2) the process for conducting and completing tenure and promotion reviews, (3) the schedule or deadlines for completing tenure and promotion reviews, and (4) a process outlining the opportunity for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members to submit a rebuttal letter at any stage of the tenure and promotion process. In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance. (6.5.1)

### D. Process for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

Faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor must submit a research and scholarship portfolio to the department by August 1 of the academic year in which they will be seeking promotion (typically, the beginning of the sixth year from date of hire, barring any approved leaves or other adjustments to the tenure clock as permitted by the CBA). These materials will be disseminated to external referees, who will have been selected based on the below process:

- Procedure for selecting and providing guidance to external referees. Reputation in the discipline must be demonstrated; a major source of evidence of reputation will be garnered from letters written by authoritative reviewers external to the University. The process for selecting reviewers will begin in the late spring of the year preceding the submission of materials. The reviewers will include individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the Department Chair, who will solicit input from faculty with relevant disciplinary expertise regarding appropriate reviewers. The Department Chair will review the list and ensure that reviewers are qualified, have no conflict of interest, and have expertise relevant to reviewing the scholarship of the candidate, based on a review of CVs. The list will be submitted to the candidate for review, and the candidate may eliminate names that he or she deems unqualified to review the credentials. Similarly, the Chair has the right to eliminate names of referees submitted by the candidate, if he or she deems the proposed referees unqualified. However, such elimination must never be so extensive that the list becomes shorter than 3 names on each list. If a list goes below 3 names owing to eliminations by either party, additional names must be added till at least 3 qualified reviewers are on each list. The Chair will compose the final list, with at least one reviewer selected from each list, with a minimum of three letters included in the file. During late spring and early summer, the Department Chair will be responsible for contacting potential reviewers, and providing the timelines and guidelines for reviewing. This will include a copy of the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, as well as the information that reviews are to focus on scholarship and service to the profession, rather than teaching. It is

important to recognize that overemphasis on external review may lead to a distortion of the standard department allocation of effort since external reviewers cannot effectively evaluate service and teaching contributions at BGSU. Every effort should be made to educate reviewers on the work assignments of the faculty member being reviewed to facilitate a review appropriate to the expectations at BGSU.

- External letters will be due September 30.

Faculty members seeking promotion from associate professor to professor must inform the Chair of their intent to submit their credentials by the end of June in the year in which they plan to submit their application, so that the process for determining external reviewers can be initiated by the Chair, as noted above for promotion to Associate Professor. The same procedure for soliciting external letters will be followed as above for tenure and promotion. Faculty members seeking promotion to professor will submit the research and service sections of their portfolios, to the Chair for distribution to the external referees (because criteria for professor may include service that may be appropriately judged by such referees, the research and service portfolio should be ready by August 1.) External letters will be due September 30.

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

#### E. Process for Making Tenure and Promotion Recommendations (Section 6.5)

1. Initial responsibility for applying the established criteria and making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion rests with the academic unit's eligible voters, who shall make a written recommendation to the Chair.
2. The Chair shall submit the recommendation of the tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the academic unit and his or her written statement agreeing or disagreeing with that recommendation to the Dean. If the recommendation of the Chair differs from that of the academic unit's tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, this recommendation of the Chair shall state the reasons for the difference. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Dean. In response, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days.
3. The Dean of the college shall make his/her own recommendation after reviewing the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Chair, and the recommendation from the college-level review committee. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation, along with and the written recommendations of the academic unit, the Chair, and the college-level review committee, to the Provost/VPAA. The faculty member being reviewed shall have an opportunity to see the recommendations before they are forwarded to the Provost/VPAA. Prior to the Dean's submission of materials to the Provost, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal letter within 2 business days of receipt.

4. The Provost/VPAA shall have the responsibility for recommending approval or disapproval to the President and the Board of Trustees. All written recommendations with appropriate supporting material appended thereto and a record of actions taken shall become part of the permanent personnel files in the Office of the Provost/VPAA.
5. Before the recommendation is forwarded to the next level, the TTF member shall be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of the evaluation process. Except for the tenure and promotion to associate professor evaluation occurring during the last year of the probationary appointment, the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any time by informing his or her Chair, Dean and Provost/VPAA, as appropriate. In cases where the candidate has the right to withdraw from the evaluation process, the recommendation shall not be forwarded to the next level and the evaluation process shall cease without prejudice regarding any future request for tenure and/or promotion.

#### F. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Art. 14, section 6.6)

1. Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. Probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall be advised of the time when decisions affecting tenure and promotion are ordinarily made and shall be given the opportunity to submit material that they believe to be pertinent to a decision.
3. Probationary tenure-track faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the period of probationary service, and denial of an early request for tenure shall have no effect on subsequent applications for tenure within the probationary period.
4. A probationary tenure-track faculty member in the last year of probationary appointment, or who presents him/herself for tenure and promotion at an earlier date, shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit (Section 6.6.5), and there shall be a single vote of recommendation for or against tenure and promotion to associate professor shall be made.
5. The academic unit's eligible voters shall consist of those Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are tenured and are at or above the rank of associate professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean of the college shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
6. An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure and promotion to associate professor be granted. Promotion to the rank of associate professor during the probationary period requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of all eligible voters in the academic unit because such action constitutes immediate tenure. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at or above the rank of

associate professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure and promotion to associate professor; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

7. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member is a tenured assistant professor, the faculty member will apply for promotion to the rank of associate professor independently of an application for tenure. In such cases, an affirmative vote of a majority of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters 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.
8. In cases where the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member begins employment at BGSU as an associate professor without tenure, the faculty member may apply for tenure independently of an application for promotion. In such cases, an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all eligible voters shall be required to recommend that tenure be granted. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters on Faculty Improvement Leaves or other approved leaves of absence have the right to participate and vote in these decisions on tenure; however, if they abstain or fail to vote, such abstention or failure to vote does not have the effect of a negative vote.

#### G. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor (Art. 14, section 6.7)

1. Evaluation for Promotion to Professor shall be in accordance with the process set forth in Section D above.
2. A tenure-track or tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who presents him/herself for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the Department.
3. The academic unit's eligible voters for candidates applying for promotion to professor shall consist of tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who are at the rank of professor. In academic units with fewer than three eligible voters, the Dean shall appoint tenured BGSU Bargaining Unit Faculty Members holding the rank of professor from related disciplines outside the unit with the consent of the unit's tenured faculty and the Chair. Appointments shall be made so as to maintain integrity of the discipline.
4. An affirmative vote of a majority of eligible voters shall be required to recommend that promotion be granted. Tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Members at the rank of professor have the responsibility to vote in decisions on promotion to professor. An abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. Eligible voters 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.

---

Approved by the Department of Communications Sciences and Disorders

Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by the Dean \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost  Date 5/6/16

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

---

## **Appendix A**

### **Instructions for Preparation of Credentials**

Portfolios must follow current university guidelines for electronic submission of credentials. Credentials submitted for APR, EPR, promotion, and tenure must include the following elements:

1. Candidates' most current CV
2. Teaching portfolio
3. Service portfolio
4. Research Portfolio (for all TTF; for NTTF when and if applicable)

Guidelines on preparation of the Teaching, Research and Service portfolios are provided above in relevant sections. For annual performance evaluations, documents and evidence will relate to the preceding academic year. For enhanced performance evaluations, documents and evidence will relate to the preceding three years. For promotion, documents and evidence will primarily relate to date of hire or date of last promotion, whichever is later. Promotion to senior levels (professor, in the case of TTF, or lecturer and senior lecturer, in the case of NTTF), may make reference to career-spanning accomplishments as part of making the case for having achieved senior status as stipulated in the criteria for promotion. In such cases, evidence may extend back prior to date of last promotion, but substantial evidence must be submitted that dates since last promotion.

Candidates for promotion or promotion and tenure must also submit their reappointment reviews from all levels (APR's and EPR's).

## Appendix B

### **GENERAL GUIDELINE ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE IN COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS.**

The faculty have agreed upon the quality indicators and minimum standards for annual performance and outlined those expectations in rubrics, provided below. For APR and EPR purposes, the rubrics will be considered to provide the standards needed for annual and enhanced evaluation—for the EPR, the rubrics will consider the total period under review, not just the preceding 12 months, with a proportional expansion of any quantitative measures, as applicable (e.g., if 1 activity is expected in 12 months, then 2 would be expected in 24 months, etc.). (Note that the period under review for an enhanced performance year review would cover work completed over approximately two years, as the portfolio must be submitted at the beginning of the faculty member's third year.) This proportional expansion would not be applied to service; instead, the expectation for service is that the portfolio demonstrates that the person has met expectations for each of the years under consideration.

For promotion, and tenure (if applicable), the Teaching and Service Rubrics will provide the guidance needed for evaluation of efforts in these areas. The evaluation will apply the rubrics as a means to evaluate the pattern of performance using these indicators over the totality of the years under consideration. The Research Rubric will also be considered in evaluating applications for promotion, and tenure, if applicable; however, for tenure-track faculty seeking promotion, additional research standards will apply as noted in the policy.

The evaluation committee and department chair will complete rubrics as indicated, related to the level under review. E.g., for EPR, the rating of at least meets expectations would indicate a positive recommendation for reappointment. For promotion and/or tenure, a rating of at least meeting expectations would indicate a positive recommendation for promotion or promotion and tenure, as applicable. For all such evaluations, a positive overall rating must occur in all areas where the candidate under review has a work assignment. If in any area a candidate receives a rating of not meeting expectations for this review, the overall evaluation will therefore not be positive. That is, strong performance in one area will not negate weak performance in another.

### **Evaluation Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Evaluation Scores**

#### **Overview**

Evaluation will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). For the



EPR and promotion/tenure reviews, evaluation committee members and the department chair will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate. For the APR, the department chair will conduct the review using these criteria.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criterion will be combined by each member of the review committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching, Research, and Service). For the APR, the department chair will be responsible for completing the rubric. For EPR and promotion or promotion and tenure reviews, department committee members of appropriate rank will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided. The department chair will complete a separate review.

**Teaching Rubric****Faculty name:****Allocation of effort to teaching: \_\_\_\_%****Teaching assignment for year(s) under review:**

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
Quantitative ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent (<i>ratings generally in the good to outstanding range</i>)</li> <li>• Good (<i>ratings generally in the good range</i>)</li> <li>• Fair (<i>ratings generally in the fair to good range</i>)</li> <li>• Poor (<i>ratings generally in poor to fair range</i>)</li> </ul>	
Student open-ended feedback—based on a representative sampling and overview of themes and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly positive</li> <li>• Positive</li> <li>• Neutral</li> <li>• Negative</li> <li>• Not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
Peer reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> <li>• N/A*</li> </ul>	
Teaching improvement/Analysis of teaching performance (incl. teaching philosophy statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In depth, thoughtful, shows improvement where needed, involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Thoughtful analysis, implementation for efforts to improve; involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Some analysis and awareness of need to improve; plans for involvement in improvement activities</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis; no evidence of needed improvement efforts under way; no planned involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>No analysis of teaching performance</li> </ul>	
High impact learning activities**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High level of activity—2 or more</li> <li>Moderate level of activity—1</li> <li>Training to incorporate high impact activities (e.g., learning community participation)</li> <li>No high impact activities</li> </ul>	
Non-classroom teaching/teaching in addition to work assignment***	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very high level of activity—3 or more with leadership roles</li> <li>High level of activity—2 or more, OR 1 with leadership role</li> <li>Moderate level of activity—1, no leadership role</li> <li>No involvement in non-classroom instruction</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	
Other ****	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Superior</li> <li>Good</li> <li>Fair</li> <li>Poor</li> </ul> <p>Performance in teaching and teaching-related activities</p>	

\* Non-tenured faculty on the tenure track, and NTTF who are going up for an Enhanced Performance Evaluation or promotion, should submit peer evaluations; anyone else may request peer evaluations, but these are not typically expected.

\*\*Service learning; undergraduate research; active learning; novel approaches to teaching (e.g. innovative clinical teaching)

\*\*\*Thesis and dissertation direction; honors project direction; graduate student mentoring; guest lecturing; clinical teaching/consulting other than assigned supervision; peer mentoring. Any other activities relating to non-classroom instruction. For NTTF, this may be scored N/A if no opportunities to participate exist.

\*\*\*Other evidence for effectiveness, including: student performance/success; pedagogical leadership activities/mentoring; teaching awards; active engagement in continuing education to support teaching effectiveness; successful development of new course(s); or any other evidence of effectiveness submitted by the faculty.

**TEACHING SCORE RUBRIC**

<b>Score (point allocation)</b>	<b>Definition and Description</b>	<b>Narrative justification</b>
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
<b>Meets Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

## Research Rubric

Name:

Allocation of effort to research (if none, do not score):

**IMPORTANT:** Allocation of effort to research must be taken into account when applying this rubric. Baseline expectation is for a 40% allocation of effort to research. For those with less, scores in a given category may be adjusted upwards to reflect achievement despite limited release time for research. For those with substantially more, committee/chair to consider revising expectations upwards, EXCEPT in the case of release time for new faculty on the tenure track who are just getting their programs of research off the ground.

For collaborative efforts, explain your role so your relative contribution can be evaluated.

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
<p><b>Research &amp; Scholarly Dissemination</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peer-reviewed papers accepted*</li> <li>2. Books and book chapters</li> <li>3. Non-peer reviewed papers</li> <li>4. Manuscripts under review</li> <li>5. Peer-reviewed presentations, selective conferences OR invited presentation, national or international</li> <li>6. Peer-reviewed presentations, less selective conference</li> <li>7. Invited presentations (regional/local)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. 4+ examples, with at least 2 from category 1 OR 3+ examples in top 2 categories</li> <li>• Excellent. 4+ examples, with at least one from category 1 OR 2 examples in category 1.</li> <li>• Very good. 3 examples, at least 1 of which is from categories 1-4.</li> <li>• Good. 2 examples from any of categories 2 through 7.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 Example.</li> <li>• Poor. No activity to report.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation.</p>	
<p><b>Research funding**</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant external grant activity (for example, award of external grants, \$25K and up; may be claimed in multiple years for multiple year grants)</li> <li>2. Awarded external grant, &lt;\$25K</li> <li>3. Awarded internal grant,</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. Category 1.</li> <li>• Excellent. Category 2 or 3.</li> <li>• Very good. Category 4, 5, and/or 6</li> <li>• Good. Category 7 or 8</li> <li>• Fair. Category 9 or 10</li> <li>• No activity.</li> </ul>	

<p>\$5K and up</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Awarded internal grant, &lt;\$5K</li> <li>5. Applied for category 1 grant</li> <li>6. Applied for category 2 grant</li> <li>7. Applied for category 3 grant</li> <li>8. Applied for category 4 grant</li> <li>9. Plan for applying for external funding</li> <li>10. Plan for applying for internal funding</li> </ol>		
<p>Ongoing research</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication</li> <li>2. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation</li> <li>3. Project in data analysis</li> <li>4. Project in data collection</li> <li>5. Project in development (e.g., HSRB protocol in preparation or pilot work being planned)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent. Category 1 activity reported and at least 1 from categories 2-4.</li> <li>• Good. 2 activities reported, from 2-4.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 activity reported, from 2-5.</li> <li>• Poor. No activity.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Reviewers are directed to recognize that some projects may change status over the course of the year; the faculty member should make clear their research trajectory. The intent is not to penalize anyone for moving projects to dissemination and making this category null in consequence.</p> <p>The committee can consider overall number and stages of development of projects in its overall assessment.</p>	
<p>Research infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good. A clear pattern of multiple activities to develop a functioning lab or project, including setting up &amp;/or learning new equipment, software, &amp;/or procedures, recruiting and training lab assistants, devising successful protocols. Evidence presented of benchmarks met (e.g., purchase of start up equipment and training in its use).</li> <li>• Adequate. Some activities, as listed above, either lesser in extent or somewhat less clear in terms of evidence</li> </ul>	

	<p>presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor. Expected benchmarks not met*** (e.g., failure to develop a functioning lab during start up period)</li> <li>• N/A. Lab is at high performance already with no need for development OR research not conducted in a lab environment.</li> </ul>	
Intellectual property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. Significant ongoing work leading to intellectual property, with clear evidence of outcomes achieved (e.g., patent application file, copyright registered for the university, or licensing agreement signed)</li> <li>• Good. Some evidence of work leading to the above.</li> <li>• N/A. NOTE: Most will be scored here. This category is not to be scored except for those who have relevant activities.</li> </ul>	
Other ****	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> </ul> <p>Performance in research and scholarship.</p> <p>If no additional evidence available for review, note "N/A"</p>	

\*The committee will consider information on the selectivity of journals in making its overall evaluation. A faculty member who meets the quantity measure for a given rating may be rated in a lower category based on information regarding selectivity and rigor of outlets. The committee will provide details in its narrative justification. Co-authorship in and of itself is not a negative for papers that are not first-authored; role on a project can be considered by the committee in its evaluation.

\*\*Activities as PI most highly ranked, but subcontracts, consultancy, and other collaborative efforts resulting in funding are eligible to be considered in categories 1 and 2.

\*\*\*This rating not to be applied if circumstances beyond the control of the researcher pertain (e.g., failure of manufacturer to deliver, unforeseen technical difficulties impede success despite best efforts, etc.). Researcher may explain such circumstances and if reasonable the committee should not score this section.



\*\*\*\*Other. Any evidence the faculty member wishes to include as evidence of scholarly achievement can be evaluated here. Examples include but are not limited to: awards and recognitions for research activities (editor's awards, university recognition, fellowship in professional and scholarly societies); substantial service that is scholarly in nature (e.g., editorship of journals, invitations to participate in reviewing activities); publications in highly selective venues or invitations to keynote at prestigious conferences; outstanding mentorship of students in research (may overlap with teaching but if relevant may be included in scholarly portfolio).

#### RUBRIC FOR TOTAL RESEARCH SCORE

Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative justification
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Research</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
<b>Meets Expectations for Research</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Research</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

**Service Rubric****Faculty name:****Allocation of effort to service:**

*NOTE: Expectations for level of service increase with rank and years in rank. Acceptable minimum performance for pre-tenure faculty will not be acceptable minimums for senior faculty. Faculty member baseline allocation of effort to service to be 10%; heavier allocation will have higher expectations. Service in categories where not expected can be counted towards exceeding expectations (e.g., pre-tenure faculty involved in university service).*

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
Faculty member fulfills advising duties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable. Is regularly available, provides appropriate advising for student success.</li> <li>• Unacceptable. Fails to be available (based on clear evidence of one or more of the following: does not hold regular office hours; refuses to schedule advising appointments when requested; fails to respond to emails); and/or regularly fails to provide appropriate advising (rating must be based on clear evidence that students are disadvantaged by wrong information)</li> <li>• N/A. No advising responsibilities.</li> </ul>	
Participation in department service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 3 or more committees/activities AND/OR chairs 1 heavy responsibility committee.</li> <li>• Excellent. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 2 or more committees/activities.</li> <li>• Good. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 1 committee.</li> <li>• Fair. Record of attendance at faculty meetings is inconsistent, &amp;/or does not support student recruitment events. Participates in 1 committee, minor role.</li> <li>• Poor. Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above.</li> <li>• N/A*</li> </ul>	
College and university service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. Participates in 2 or more college or university committees/efforts with a leadership role in one.</li> <li>• Excellent. Participates in two college or university committees/efforts OR chairs one OR participates in exceptionally heavy workload committee (e.g., HSRB).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good. Participates in at least one college or university committee/effort with significant workload.</li> <li>• Fair. Participates in one college or university committee with minimal workload.</li> <li>• Poor. No college or university service. OR</li> <li>• N/A Service not required in early years on tenure track. OR not required of NTTF.</li> </ul>	
Service to the profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, and a leadership role</li> <li>• Excellent. 3 or more activities OR leadership role in 1. *</li> <li>• Good. 2 activities.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 activity.</li> <li>• Poor. No service to the profession.** OR</li> <li>• N/A. Service to the profession not expected.</li> </ul>	
Community service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, plus leadership role(s)</li> <li>• Excellent. 3 or more activities.</li> <li>• Good. 2 activities.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 activity.</li> <li>• Poor. No service to the community.** OR</li> <li>• N/A. Service to the community not expected.</li> </ul>	
Other ***	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> </ul> <p>Performance in service.</p>	

\*For pre-tenure and tenure-track faculty, ratings in the “excellent” category would be considered unusual and evidence of exceeding expectations.

\* \*For pre-tenure faculty, N/A is appropriate if nothing reported in this category. For tenured faculty, at least one activity in either professional service or community service is a minimum expectation. If submitting in one but not the other, tenured faculty may be rated “N/A” in the area not selected for service.

\*\*\*Other evidence for effectiveness submitted by the faculty member to be rated here, including but not limited to: awards for service; unusual amount of service for rank/years in rank; exceptional leadership and/or unique projects with high impact; high visibility in state and national service, etc. Faculty should provide sufficient information so that the committee can determine what the role was that the faculty member played.

#### RUBRIC FOR TOTAL SERVICE SCORE

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition	Narrative justification
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Service</b>  <b>(6-7)</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
<b>Meets Expectations for Service</b>  <b>(3-5)</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Service</b>  <b>(0-2)</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

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.

---

Approved by the Department of Communications Sciences and Disorders

Chair  Date May 4, 2016

Reviewed by the Dean Marie Hays Date 5/4/2016

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

---

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost  Date May 10, 2016

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

---