

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Inclusive Teacher Education

A. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) of Qualified-Rank Faculty (QRF) in Years One-Six

1. Criteria used for APR and EPR of QRF evaluate teaching and service. The typical workload allocation for QRF members is 80% teaching and 20% service. Alternative allocations may be approved by the school director and dean. The workload allocation for each year under review shall be documented in dossiers submitted for APRs and EPRs. Documented adjustments to workload allocations shall be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas shall be included in the portfolio.
2. Consistent high-quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the major evaluation domains of teaching and service are fundamental criteria for all QRF evaluations. For EPRs, any concerns expressed in the previous reviews shall be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period shall be demonstrated.
3. If participation in a graduate program is a component of the appointment, maintenance of the appropriate level of graduate faculty status is required.
4. Teaching
 - a. High-quality instruction (as detailed in the following section) is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (1) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (2) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (3) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.
 - b. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. For the first two APRs, indicators (1) – (4) are required. One additional indicator may be included in the dossier but is not required. For remaining APRs and EPRs, indicators (1) – (2) plus three additional indicators are required.
 - (1) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section B. An overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.
 - (2) In the first two years, two peer evaluations, one each semester, or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study, that indicate effective teaching (i.e., ≥ 3.50 rating on a 5.00 scale, positive comments, absence of significant concerns), for the period under review are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching or evidence

of engagement in peer lesson study is required each year. Peer evaluations shall be arranged in consultation with the school director and faculty mentor and documented following the guidelines provided by the school. Forms for these processes are housed in the School. This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.

- (3) In the first three years, faculty are required to observe a colleague teaching at BGSU. These observations shall be arranged in consultation with the director and/or faculty mentor and documented following the guidelines provided by the school. Reflection on these observations shall be included in the teaching narrative.
- (4) A course syllabus that demonstrates a clear statement on course expectations, the schedule and methods of assessment, indicators of support for student success (e.g., office hours, identification of support services such as the Learning Commons), and pedagogical efforts that engage students in the learning process. This artifact shall also include a sample student assignment, assessment, or other document that aligns with the syllabus. These items shall demonstrate clearly communicated expectations and quality feedback that align with the teaching narrative with a reflective analysis of their alignment with the candidate's teaching philosophy. This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
- (5) Self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness that provide evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback and reflective practices.
- (6) Course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period with a reflective analysis of those student comments, including efforts to address areas of concern.
- (7) Description of course revisions to better address issues of inclusion and diversity (e.g., diverse identities of authors of assigned readings; specific modules, assignments, or class activities with focus on inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism; use of culturally responsive pedagogy).
- (8) Documentation of significant supervision of independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students.
- (9) Undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by a description of advising and advising contributions (e.g., advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the school director; redacted emails to students with advice and/or feedback to advisees).
- (10) Description and documentation of full approval for a new course, substantial course modification of 50% or greater, new program, or substantial program modification.
- (11) Chair or committee member on completed thesis, dissertation, preliminary/comprehensive exam, masters projects, and/or honors project committees. Chairs or committee members shall provide timely feedback to students to aid in students' progress toward degree completion. Faculty members shall provide a chart listing the student committees on which they served, the dates at which students passed program milestones (e.g., proposal and final defense), and a description of their contributions to these committees.

- (12) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.
- (13) Participation in or leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
- (14) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at or beyond the university level.
- (15) Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills with a description of how those activities were applied to enhance teaching effectiveness.
- (16) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.
- (17) Articles, proceedings, and/or presentations pertaining to teaching.
- (18) Evidence of teaching effectiveness that contributes to student success and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence and explain in the teaching narrative)

5. Service

- a. Substantive service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the university. An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (1) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (2) a description of evolution or improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (3) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet necessary standards and criteria. At least three and no more than five performance indicators shall be included in the dossier.
- b. Faculty seeking reappointment through APRs and EPRs shall provide evidence of service to the University community. The school defines service as performance at any of these levels of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation that provides evidence of their individual activities and contributions that address the performance indicators used for evaluation. Recommended artifacts include brief verifications of contributions from committee chairs or directors, copies of materials developed with contributions highlighted, or relevant documentation of contribution.

- c. Remunerated service shall be indicated as such and shall not constitute more than 20% of the overall service contributions.
- d. Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of two levels each year for APR. For the EPR, faculty shall document effective service across at least three levels with an average of at least two service activities per year across all years in the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this shall be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. Service as assistant director or graduate or undergraduate program coordinator (Indicator 1) fulfills all service obligations for that year, superseding requirements for service at multiple levels. Potential performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) of service include but are not limited to those listed below. Artifacts shall provide evidence of substantive contributions to service activities.
 - (1) Assistant director or graduate or undergraduate program coordinator (including appointment to the EDHD Faculty Leadership Council).
 - (2) Administrative role such as faculty lead, center director, etc.
 - (3) Active member or leader of school, college, university committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, or task forces.
 - (4) Editorial board member or reviewer (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.
 - (5) Speaker at workshops and/or engagements (e.g., keynote) related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university.
 - (6) Active member or leader of professional association committee. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes.
 - (7) Preparer/author/coordinator of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This is considered school-level service.
 - (8) Advisor for student organization.
 - (9) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.
 - (10) External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching is valued but not required. With a written agreement from the school director and endorsement of the dean, external community service related to the discipline may be considered service.
 - (11) Evidence of contributions to the public good through service related to one's discipline (provide supporting evidence and explain in the service narrative)

B. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF APR and EPR Materials

All required APR and EPR materials shall be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents shall be saved as a PDF and clearly labeled. Portfolios shall include all required materials

for teaching and service detailed in Section A. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of QRF in Years One-Six. In all cases, faculty shall include:

1. Unit reappointment, tenure, and promotion document by which candidate is to be evaluated
2. A current CV in the BGSU format with activities for the period under review highlighted
3. A summary of the workload allocations for the period under review
4. Prior annual review and enhanced performance review letters from the school director and dean
5. Teaching and service narratives and required and optional artifacts (no more than 5 in each domain) as described in Section A
6. The table of quantitative student course evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X	School Mean
Average mean for all courses					
If appropriate, describe any extenuating circumstances that may have influenced an overall course mean:					

C. Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF APR Process

1. Eligible unit faculty members shall meet to review each APR. In a letter uploaded to the current submission platform by the personnel chair or other designated BUFGM, faculty shall provide detailed feedback on the candidate’s progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for the next EPR.
2. No vote is taken or recorded for the APR.

D. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in QRF Promotion Review

1. Appointment as or promotion to QRF-associate professor requires consistent achievement in teaching and service and notable improvement in areas of concern noted in prior reviews. Appointment as or promotion to QRF-professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness and sustained and substantial service contributions within and external to BGSU. Promotion requires standards and criteria to be met in both teaching and service.
2. The following criteria and standards shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching and service. For promotion to QRF-associate professor, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since the most recent appointment as QRF-assistant professor, with emphasis on the prior six-year period. For promotion to QRF-professor, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since the most recent appointment as QRF-associate professor, with emphasis on the prior six-year period. Documentation of the workload allocation for all years under review shall be provided.

3. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor

a. Teaching

- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.
- (2) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section E. For promotion to QRF-associate professor, an overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.
- (3) At least three peer evaluations of teaching or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study for the period under review, as described in Section A.4.b.(2). This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
- (4) At least three additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section A.4.b.(3)—(18).

b. Service

- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet necessary standards and criteria.
- (2) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section A.5.d.(1)—(11).

4. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor

a. Teaching

- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

- (a) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.
- (2) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section E. For promotion to QRF-professor, an overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.75 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.
- (3) At least three peer evaluations of teaching or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study for the period under review, as described in Section A.4.b.(2). This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
- (4) At least three additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section A.4.b.(3)—(18), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in teaching. Leadership in teaching that shall be considered for promotion to QRF-professor includes:
- (a) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.
 - (b) Leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
 - (c) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
 - (d) Serving as peer evaluator of teaching for a colleague.
 - (e) Evidence of leadership in enhancing teaching effectiveness that contributes to student success and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence and explain in the teaching narrative).
- b. Service
- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
- (a) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet necessary standards and criteria.
- (2) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section A.5.d.(1)—(11), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in service. Leadership in service that shall be considered for promotion to QRF-professor includes:

- (a) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., serving as program coordinator, chairing at least two major committees, leading curriculum revisions, mentoring other faculty members).
- (b) Chairing a committee at the college or university level.
- (c) Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a state, regional, or national professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
- (d) Evidence of leading contributions to the public good through service related to one's discipline (provide supporting evidence and explain in the service narrative).

E. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF Promotion Materials

All required QRF promotion materials shall be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents shall be saved as a PDF and clearly labeled. Portfolios shall include all required materials for teaching and service detailed in Section D. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in QRF Promotion Review. In all cases, faculty shall include:

1. Unit reappointment, tenure, and promotion document by which candidate is to be evaluated
2. A current CV in the BGSU format with activities for the time period under review highlighted
3. A summary of the workload allocations for the period under review
4. Prior annual review and enhanced performance review letters from the school director and dean (only for promotion to QRF-associate professor); for promotion to QRF-professor, include only the dean and provost letter recommending promotion to QRF-associate professor
5. Teaching and service narratives and required and optional artifacts (no more than 5 in each domain) as described in Section D
6. The table of quantitative student course evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X	School Mean
Average mean for all courses					
If appropriate, describe any extenuating circumstances that may have influenced an overall course mean:					

F. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)

1. Criteria used for APR and EPR of TTF evaluate teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The typical allocation is 50% teaching, 30% scholarly/creative activity, and 20% service, The workload allocation approved by the school director and dean for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for each year under review shall be documented in dossiers submitted for APRs and EPRs. Documented adjustments to workload allocations shall be taken into

consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas shall be included in the portfolio.

2. Consistent high-quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the major evaluation domains of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service are fundamental criteria for all TTF evaluations. For EPRs, any concerns expressed in the previous reviews shall be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period shall be demonstrated.
3. If participation in a graduate program is a component of the appointment, maintenance of the appropriate level of graduate faculty status is required.
4. Teaching
 - a. High-quality instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (1) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (2) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon; and
 - (3) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated criteria and standards.
 - b. For the first two APRs, performance indicators (1)—(4) are required. One additional indicator may be included in the dossier but is not required. For remaining APRs and EPRs, indicators (1)—(2) plus three additional indicators are required.
 - (1) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section G. An overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.
 - (2) In the first two years, two peer evaluations, one each semester, that indicate effective teaching (i.e., ≥ 3.50 rating on a 5.00 scale, positive comments, absence of significant concerns) or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study, for the period under review are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study is required each year. Peer evaluations shall be arranged in consultation with the school director and faculty mentor and documented following the guidelines provided by the school. Forms for these processes are housed in the School. This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
 - (3) In the first three years, faculty are required to observe a colleague teaching at BGSU. These observations shall be arranged in consultation with the director and/or faculty mentor and documented following the guidelines provided by the school. Reflection on these observations shall be included in the teaching narrative.
 - (4) A course syllabus that demonstrates a clear statement on course expectations, the schedule and methods of assessment, indicators of support for student success (e.g., office hours, identification of support services such as the Learning Commons), and pedagogical efforts that engage students in the learning process. Submissions shall

include sample student assignments, assessments, and other materials that align with the syllabi. These items shall demonstrate clearly communicated expectations and quality feedback that align with the teaching narrative with a reflective analysis of their alignment with the candidate's teaching philosophy. This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.

- (5) Self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness that provide evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback and reflective practices.
- (6) Course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period with a reflective analysis of those student comments, including efforts to address areas of concern.
- (7) Evidence of course updates to better address issues of inclusion and diversity (e.g., diverse identities of authors of assigned readings; specific modules, assignments, or class activities with focus on inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism; use of culturally responsive pedagogy).
- (8) Significant supervision of independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students.
- (9) Undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by a description of advising and advising contributions (e.g., advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the school director; redacted emails to students with advice and/or feedback to advisees).
- (10) Description and documentation of full approval of new course, substantial course modification of 50% or greater, new program, or substantial program modification.
- (11) Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills with a description of how those activities were applied to enhance teaching effectiveness
- (12) Chair or committee member on completed thesis, dissertation, preliminary/comprehensive exam, masters projects, and/or honors project committees. Chairs shall provide timely feedback to students to aid in students' progress toward degree completion. Faculty members shall provide a chart listing the student committees on which they served, the dates at which students passed program milestones (e.g., proposal and final defense), and a description of their contributions to these committees.
- (13) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.
- (14) Participation in or leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
- (15) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at or beyond the university level.
- (16) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university

- (17) Articles, proceedings, and/or presentations pertaining to teaching with a description of how those activities were applied to enhance teaching effectiveness
- (18) Published or unpublished pedagogical materials
- (19) Evidence of teaching effectiveness that contributes to student success and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence and explain in the teaching narrative)

5. Scholarly/Creative Activity

- a. Making ongoing significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the school's evaluation of tenure-track faculty members who are undergoing review. Faculty evaluations are based on professional judgment of performance and focus on consistency, quality, and quantity of output by the faculty member. Reviews shall focus not just on the quantity of scholarly activities but also on the quality of the scholarly/creative activity.
- b. Scholarly/creative activity shall show evidence of originality and importance. In the CV and/or the narrative, faculty members shall provide evidence of quality and context of publications (Examples may include acceptance rate, impact factor, citations count, publisher, and/or intended audience of publication).
- c. External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking promotion to associate professor or professor are required. The primary purpose for external reviews is to evaluate a candidate's scholarly work in terms of quality, quantity, impact on the discipline, and national and/or international presence. Candidates for promotion to professor shall have evidence of a positive national and/or international presence. Presence within the discipline shall be judged primarily by external reviewers. The primary focus of evaluation for promotion to professor shall be on activities since promotion to associate professor, with particular emphasis on the prior six-year period. Sustained and regular engagement in the scholarly/creative activity of the profession is expected. Significant gaps in scholarly productivity (e.g., during service as a faculty administrator or significant editorial responsibilities) shall be explained by the candidate. The process for selecting external reviewers shall follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.
- d. Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications, but faculty members shall clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.
- e. In press publications are considered published, but faculty members shall clearly document submission and acceptance of the final manuscript.
- f. For APR and EPR, an academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in scholarly/creative activity (minimum of one page single-spaced and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (1) a description of the scholarly/creative activity (research) agenda,

- (2) a description of evolution or improvement in scholarly/creative activity over the year(s) under review, including how feedback in previous reviews have been addressed, and
 - (3) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and their relation to the scholarly/creative activity (research) agenda, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation index, acceptance rate); description of the faculty member's specific contributions to co-authored publications, presentations, and/or grants; and how the indicators illustrate scholarly effectiveness and meet stated criteria and standards.
- g. Indicators of effectiveness in scholarly/creative activity are specified below.
- (1) For the first APR, faculty members shall include the scholarly/creative activity narrative plus evidence of progress toward a minimum of two performance indicators of scholarly/creative activity (research) activity (e.g., manuscript submitted for review, conference proposal, or IRB proposal submitted).
 - (2) For the second APR, faculty members shall include the scholarly/creative activity narrative, minimum of 3 no more than 5 performance indicators, including at least two refereed publications under review, in press, or published.
 - (3) For the EPR, faculty members shall include the scholarly/creative activity narrative and a minimum of three no more than five indicators of scholarly/creative activity. One shall be a published or in press peer-reviewed journal article. A second shall be one additional peer-reviewed publication that is published, in press, or under review or an awarded external grant.
 - (4) For APRs after the EPR, faculty members shall include the scholarly/creative activity narrative and show steady progress toward meeting expectations for tenure and promotion.
 - (5) Faculty shall have an average of at least one regional, state, national or international peer reviewed, invited, or keynote presentation at a professional conference each year.
 - (6) Indicators of scholarly effectiveness
 - (a) Scholarly, peer-reviewed journal article, book, book chapter including (where available) documentation of the peer review process for books and book chapters and citation index, acceptance rate, distribution, or other indicators of quality)
 - (b) Competitive external grant in the amount of \$20,000 or greater
 - (c) Funded internal grant
 - (d) Unfunded external grant (for APR and EPR only)
 - (e) Refereed proceedings
 - (f) Non-refereed academic book or book chapter (self-published manuscripts not acceptable)
 - (g) Published book review in peer-reviewed journal

- (h) Invited chapters and creative products
- (i) Refereed presentation, poster, workshop at professional conferences
- (j) Peer reviewed conference proceedings
- (k) Editor/associate editor/guest editor of peer reviewed journal
- (l) Invited presentation at regional, state, national, or international conference; invited presentations and keynotes may provide evidence of a national or international presence, but do not substitute for peer reviewed publications and presentations
- (m) Published symposia
- (n) Encyclopedia chapter
- (o) Member of journal editorial board
- (p) Scholarly or creative awards
- (q) Evidence of contributions to public good through scholarly/creative activities (provide supporting evidence and explain in the scholarly/creative activity narrative)

6. Service

- a. Substantive service contributions by faculty are critical to the overall mission of the university. Beginning with the second APR and for the EPR, an academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (1) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (2) a description of improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (3) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated criteria and standards. At least three and no more than five performance indicators shall be included in the dossier.
- b. Faculty seeking reappointment through APRs and EPRs shall provide evidence of appropriate and effective service to the University community. The school defines service as performance at any of these levels of program, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation. In presenting their records of service, faculty members shall include documentation that provides evidence of their individual activities and contributions

that address the performance indicators used for evaluation. Recommended artifacts include brief verifications of contributions from committee chairs or directors, copies of materials developed with contributions highlighted, or relevant documentation of contribution.

- c. Remunerated service shall be indicated as such and shall not constitute more than 20% of the overall service contributions.
- d. Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of one level for the first APR and a minimum of two levels for subsequent APRs. For the EPR, faculty shall document effective service across at least three levels for the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this shall be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. Service as assistant director or graduate or undergraduate program coordinator (indicator 1) fulfills all service obligations for that year, superseding requirements for service at multiple levels. Potential performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) of service include but are not limited to those listed below. Artifacts shall provide evidence of substantive contributions to service activities.
 - (1) Assistant director or graduate or undergraduate program coordinator (including appointment to the EDHD Faculty Leadership Council).
 - (2) Administrative role such as faculty lead, center director, etc.
 - (3) Active member or leader of school, college, university committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, or task forces.
 - (4) Editorial board member or reviewer (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.
 - (5) Speaker at workshops and/or engagements (e.g., keynote) related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university.
 - (6) Active member or leader of professional association committee. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes.
 - (7) Preparer/author/coordinator of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This is considered school-level service.
 - (8) Advisor to student organizations. The level of service is dependent on who is eligible to join. University = all students; college = EDHD students; school = school students; program = program students.
 - (9) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.
 - (10) External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching is valued but not required. With a written agreement from the school director, external community service related to the discipline may substitute for college or university service.
 - (11) Evidence of contributions to the public good through service related to one's discipline (provide supporting evidence and explain in the service narrative).

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

All required TTF APR and EPR materials shall be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents shall be saved as a PDF and clearly labeled. Portfolios shall include all required materials for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service detailed in Section F. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF. In all cases, faculty shall include:

1. Unit reappointment, tenure, and promotion document by which candidate is to be evaluated
2. A current CV in the BGSU format with activities for the time period under review highlighted
3. A summary of the workload allocations for the period under review
4. Prior annual review and enhanced performance review letters from the school director and dean
5. Teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service narratives and required and optional artifacts (no more than 5 in each domain) as described in Section F
6. The table of quantitative student course evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X	School Mean
Average mean for all courses					
If appropriate, describe any extenuating circumstances that may have influenced an overall course mean:					

H. Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

1. Eligible unit faculty members shall meet to review each APR. In a letter uploaded to the current submission platform by the personnel chair or other designated BUFM, faculty shall provide detailed feedback on the candidate’s progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for the next EPR.
2. No vote is taken or recorded for the APR.

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

1. Criteria used for tenure and/or promotion of TTF evaluate teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The workload allocation for each year under review shall be documented in dossiers submitted for tenure and/or promotion reviews. Documented adjustments to workload allocations shall be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas shall be included in the portfolio. Tenure and/or promotion requires standards and criteria to be met in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
2. Appointment as or promotion to associate professor requires consistent achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service and notable improvement in areas of concern

noted in prior reviews. Appointment as or promotion to professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness, scholarly productivity, and sustained and substantial service contributions within and external to BGSU.

3. As appropriate, candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor shall have the necessary graduate faculty status and level of privileges required to perform assigned duties.
4. The following criteria and standards shall be used to evaluate achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the evaluation shall consider the period since appointment as assistant professor plus any time credited at the time of the appointment, if applicable. For promotion to professor, the primary focus of evaluation shall be on the period since the most recent appointment as associate professor, with emphasis on the prior six-year period.
5. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
 - a. Teaching
 - (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.
 - (2) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section J. For promotion to associate professor, an overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.
 - (3) At least three peer evaluations of teaching or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study for the period under review, as described in Section F.4.b.(2). This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
 - (4) At least three additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section F.4.b.(3)—(19).
 - b. Scholarly/Creative Activity
 - (1) Evaluation of scholarly/creative activity shall be guided by the principles outlined in Section F.5.a-g.
 - (a) a description of the scholarly/creative activity (research) agenda
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in scholarly/creative activity over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and

- (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and their relation to the scholarly/creative activity agenda, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation index, acceptance rate); description of the faculty member's specific contributions to co-authored publications, presentations, and/or grants; and how the indicators illustrate scholarly/creative activity effectiveness and meet stated criteria and standards.
 - (2) Faculty shall have at least six indicators of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness, at least five shall be from Section F.5.g.6.(a)—(b).
 - (3) Faculty shall have an average of at least one regional, state, national, international peer reviewed, keynote, or invited presentation at a professional conference each year.
 - (4) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.5.g.(1)—(6).
 - c. Service
 - (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet necessary standards and criteria.
 - (2) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.6.d.(1)—(11).
6. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
- a. Teaching
 - (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in teaching (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in professional literature,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in teaching over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.
 - (2) Table of course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section J. For promotion to professor, an overall quantitative mean score of at least 3.75 on a 5-point scale is considered one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

- (3) At least three peer evaluations of teaching or evidence of engagement in peer lesson study for the period under review, as described in Section F.4.b.(2). This artifact shall be saved as a single PDF document.
 - (4) At least three additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section F.4.b.(3)—(19), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in teaching. Leadership in teaching that shall be considered for promotion to professor includes:
 - (a) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.
 - (b) Leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
 - (c) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
 - (d) Serving as peer evaluator of teaching for a colleague.
 - (e) Evidence of leadership in enhancing teaching effectiveness that contributes to student success and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence and explain in the teaching narrative).
- b. Scholarly/Creative Activity
- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in scholarly/creative activity (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) a description of the scholarly/creative activity (research) agenda,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in scholarly/creative activity over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier and their relation to the scholarly/creative activity (research) agenda, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation index, acceptance rate); description of the faculty member's specific contributions to co-authored publications, presentations, and/or grants; and how the indicators illustrate scholarly/creative activity effectiveness and meet stated criteria and standards.
 - (2) Faculty shall have at least six indicators of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness, at least five shall be from Section F.5.g.6.(a)—(b).
 - (3) Faculty shall have an average of at least one regional, state, national, international peer reviewed, keynote, or invited presentation at a professional conference each year.
 - (4) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.5.g.(1)—(6).

c. Service

- (1) An academically written narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (minimum of one single-spaced page and no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:
 - (a) philosophy of or approach to service activities,
 - (b) a description of evolution or improvement in or expansion of service over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed and improved upon, and
 - (c) an explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet necessary standards and criteria.
- (2) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.6.d.(1)—(11), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in service. Leadership in service that shall be considered for promotion to professor includes:
 - (a) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., serving as program coordinator, chairing at least two major committees, leading curriculum revisions, mentoring other faculty members).
 - (b) Chairing a committee at the college or university level.
 - (c) Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a state, regional, or national professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
 - (d) Evidence of leading contributions to the public good through service related to one's discipline (provide supporting evidence and explain in the service narrative).

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

All required TTF tenure and promotion materials shall be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents shall be saved as a PDF and clearly labeled. Portfolios shall include all required materials for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service detailed in *Section I. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review*. In all cases, faculty shall include:

1. Unit reappointment, tenure, and promotion document by which candidate is to be evaluated
2. A current CV in the BGSU format with activities for the time period under review highlighted
3. A summary of the workload allocations for the period under review
4. Prior annual review and enhanced performance review letters from the school director and dean (only for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor); for promotion to professor, include only the dean and provost letter recommending tenure and/or promotion to associate professor
5. Teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service narratives and required and optional artifacts (no more than 5 in each domain) as described in Section I
6. The table of quantitative student course evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X	School Mean
Average mean for all courses					
If appropriate, describe any extenuating circumstances that may have influenced an overall course mean:					

Approved by:

Tracy Huziak-Clark

Tracy Huziak-Clark (Mar 26, 2024 17:26 EDT)

Director, School of Inclusive Teacher Education

03/26/2024

Date

Dawn Shiney

Dawn Shiney (Mar 28, 2024 12:50 EDT)

Dean, College of Education and Human Development

03/28/2024

Date

Joe Whitehead

Joe Whitehead (Mar 28, 2024 16:42 EDT)

Provost and Senior Vice President

03/28/2024

Date