Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Public and Allied Health

QRF Guidelines (pages 1-14)
TTF Guidelines (pages 15-31)

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

APRs and EPRs for QRF shall reflect the two areas of 1) teaching and 2) service that are expected of all QRF in the unit. Customarily, QRF are assigned 80% teaching and 20% service, however, a QRF may be assigned a different allocation of effort based on needs of the program. Any expectations for scholarly/creative activity will be established between the faculty member and the Department Chair. Specific domains used in the evaluation of scholarly/creative activity for participating QRF include publications/presentations and institutional outreach/scholarship of community engagement/scholarship of teaching and learning. Identification of "meeting these standards" will be based upon demonstration of accomplishment in these areas: teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity (if assigned). Identification of failure to meet these standards will be based upon demonstration of a lack of meeting the basic standard in any one of these areas. Details about these standards are described in sections I, II, and III below.

Faculty members who have been assigned administrative responsibilities and/or other responsibilities as defined and agreed upon by the Department Chair and with the Dean's concurrence at the time of assignment will also have their performance evaluated with respect to fulfilling those responsibilities.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness by QRF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the Program, Department, College, and University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of QRF members who are under review for APR, EPR, or Reappointment. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching (if QRF has Graduate Faculty Status), instructional development, and other contributions to student learning. Given the Department's involvement in undergraduate degree programs, it considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a principal component of a QRF member's record of teaching.

Beginning in the first year of a QRF teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date Teaching Dossier that contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The dossier will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs.
    b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
    c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in student or peer evaluations, if appropriate.
    d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
    e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.

      f. Undergraduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment).

2. Courses Taught
    a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the score range.
    b. Upload course evaluations from all courses, including both quantitative scores and qualitative comments.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Overall Mean Undergraduate Mean Graduate Mean (if taught)			#.## #.## #.##

Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

    c. See Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment section below for required scores.
    d. Two (2) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below.

3. Evidence of instructional development
    a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in online dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment section below for details).
    b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.
    c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.
    d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

4. Administrative Assignment (if part of assignment)
    a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the position.

Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment:

To meet the minimum standards for APR, EPR, and reappointment, QRF are expected to show evidence of the following:

1. Undergraduate Teaching/Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):
   a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged from the preceding year (for APR) or preceding three years (for EPR), they are equal to or exceed the middle rating of the scale or instrument being used (e.g., ≥3.0 on a 5-point scale instrument), with the exception for candidates in their first year of teaching who are expected to have a minimum of 2.5 on a 5-point scale.
   b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching.
   c. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least two additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of two documents are required and not two for Undergraduate and another two for Graduate classes).
2. Peer Evaluation
   a. Obtain one (1) peer review for APR and three (3) peer reviews for EPR using the PAH peer review form with an overall/aggregate score of 2.0.
   b. Peer evaluations should be performed by faculty or faculty administrators who have achieved promotion and/or tenure.
   c. At least one evaluation should be completed from within BUFM's program area.
3. Instructional Development
   a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses (for APR), or at least one syllabus from each of the preceding three years for EPR.
   b. Evidence of instructional development using at least one of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.
4. Significant Contributions to Student Learning
   a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.
   b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.
   c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:
      i. academic advising services provided to students;
      ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;
      iii. coordination of comprehensive examinations;
      iv. participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
      v. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List:
1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).
2. Unsolicited letters from students.

3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.
4. Other forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses).
7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching (after year three when no longer required).

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. QRF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or profession.

QRF seeking reappointment shall provide evidence of appropriate service that falls into two levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service). Service may include involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, or contributions to a faculty member's profession.

In presenting their records of service, QRF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and address the performance indicators, in addition to other artifacts, used for evaluation. Candidates will do this by:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Narrative that describes service philosophy and involvement.
    b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
    c. Candidates shall include at least four (4) total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
    d. QRF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service work.

Required Service Evidence:
1. (Required) One PAH/Program Committee.

2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the QRF members expertise.
3. (Required) Please choose two (2) of the following to achieve the required four pieces of evidence:
    a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.
    b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
    c. Advisor for student organizations.
    d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.
    e. Supervision of guided research.
    f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
    g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
    h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
    i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
    j. Community service pertaining to the QRF members area of expertise.
    k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF, APR, EPR and Reappointment Materials

All QRF are required to submit materials in support of the APR and EPR by the established deadlines. Both APR and EPR shall require that the QRF compile a Dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching and service. All Dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in the APR for QRF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of service effectiveness

Evidence considered in the EPR for QRF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of service effectiveness
5. Copies of annual performance reviews since appointment

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.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF APR Process

APRs shall be conducted by the Department Chair. In cases where the QRF has been assigned a faculty mentor as part of the Success Plan, the Chair may consult with that mentor for input to the APR.

EPRs will be reviewed by the CHHS committee for RPT. Eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process shall vote on EPR. The eligible voters shall provide a written

recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Assistant Professor to QRF-Associate Professor

Please review the CBA for criteria and discuss with your Department Chair if you would like to apply early for promotion.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
   a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs
   b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
   c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in evaluations, if appropriate.
   d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
   e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.
   f. Undergraduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment).
2. Courses Taught
   a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the score range.
   b. Upload course evaluations from all courses, including both quantitative scores and qualitative comments.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Overall Mean **Undergraduate Mean**			#.## #.##

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Graduate Mean (if taught)			#.##

Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

    c. See Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for required scores.
    d. Two (2) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List detailed below.

3. Evidence of instructional development
    a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in online dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for details).
    b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.
    c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.
    d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

4. Administrative Assignment (if part of appointment)
    a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the position.

Minimal Standards for Promotion to QRF-Associate Professor:
To meet the minimum standards for promotion, QRF are expected to show evidence of the following:

1. Undergraduate Teaching/ Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):
    a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged for the past six years, are equal to or exceed the 3.0 score on a 5-point scale instrument.
    b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching.
    c. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least two additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of two documents are required and not two for Undergraduate and another two for Graduate classes).

2. Instructional Development
    a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses.
    b. Evidence of instructional development using at least one of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.

3. Significant Contributions to Student Learning
    a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.
    b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.
    c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:
        i. academic advising services provided to students;
        ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;

      iii.   coordination of comprehensive examinations;
      iv.   participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
      v.   Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List
1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).
2. Unsolicited letters from students.
3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.
4. Forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses).
7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching.

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. QRF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee or other similar effort) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or profession.

QRF seeking promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service that falls into the following levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service). Service may include involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, or contributions to a faculty member's profession.

In presenting their records of service, QRF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and address the performance indicators, in addition to other artifacts, used for evaluation. Candidates will do this by:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)

a. Narrative describes service philosophy and involvement.
b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
c. Candidates shall include at least <u>five (5)</u> total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
d. QRF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service or administrative work.

Required Service Artifacts:
1. (Required) One PAH/Program Committee.
2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the QRF members expertise.
3. (Required) Please choose three (3) of the following to achieve the required five pieces of evidence:
    a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.
    b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
    c. Advisor for student organizations.
    d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.
    e. Supervision of guided research.
    f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
    g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
    h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
    i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
    j. Community service pertaining to the QRF members area of expertise.
    k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF Promotion Materials
QRF members shall electronically submit all required documents according to the timeline required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Promotion shall require that the QRF compile a Dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching and service. All Dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in promotion for QRF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of service effectiveness
5. Copies of annual performance reviews since initial appointment

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.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF promotion process:
A request by a QRF for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process. The eligible voters shall provide a written

recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. The Provost will provide a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards for Promotion from QRF-Associate Professor to QRF-Professor

Please review the CBA for criteria and discuss with your Department Chair if you would like to go up early for promotion.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs.
    b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
    c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in student or peer evaluations, if appropriate.
    d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
    e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.
    f. Undergraduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment)
2. Courses Taught
    a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the score range.
    b. Upload course evaluations from all courses, including both quantitative scores and qualitative comments.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Overall Mean			#.##

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Undergraduate Mean			#.##
Graduate Mean (if taught)			#.##

Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

    c. See Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for required scores.
    d. Three (3) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below.
3. Evidence of instructional development
    a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in online dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for details).
    b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.
    c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.
    d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.
4. Administrative Assignment (if part of appointment)
    a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the position.

Minimal Standards for Promotion to QRF-Professor:
To meet the minimum standards for promotion, QRF are expected to show evidence of the following:
1. Undergraduate Teaching/ Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):
    a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged for the past three years, are equal to or exceed the 3.75 score on a 5-point scale instrument.
    b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching.
    c. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least three additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of three documents are required and not three for Undergraduate and another three for Graduate classes).

2. Instructional Development
    a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses.
    b. Evidence of instructional development using at least two of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.
3. Significant Contributions to Student Learning
    a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.
    b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.
    c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:
        i. academic advising services provided to students;

ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;
iii. coordination of comprehensive examinations;
iv. participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
v. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List
1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).
2. Unsolicited letters from students.
3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.
4. Forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses).
7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching.

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. QRF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee or other similar effort) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or profession.

QRF seeking promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service that fall into two levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service). Service may include involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, or contributions to a faculty member's profession.

Candidates should show evidence of chairing or taking a leadership role in at least one committee, task force, working group, or project. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity in their service narrative.

In presenting their records of service, QRF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions and address the performance indicators, in addition to other artifacts, used for evaluation. Candidates will do this by:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Narrative that describes service philosophy and involvement.
    b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
    c. Candidates shall include at least six (6) total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
    d. QRF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service work.

Required Service Artifacts:
1. (Required) One PAH/Program Committee.
2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the QRF members expertise.
3. (Required) Leadership role in at least one committee, task force, working group, or project.
4. (Required) Please choose four (4) of the following to achieve the required six pieces of evidence:
    a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.
    b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
    c. Advisor for student organizations.
    d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.
    e. Supervision of guided research.
    f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
    g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
    h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
    i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
    j. Community service pertaining to the QRF members area of expertise.
    k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of QRF Promotion Materials
QRF members shall electronically submit all required documents according to the timeline required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Promotion shall require that the QRF compile a Dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching and service. All dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in promotion for QRF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of service effectiveness

5. Copies of annual performance reviews (merit) from previous six years or last promotion period, inclusive of the current academic year

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.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the QRF promotion process:
A request by a QRF for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process. The eligible voters shall provide a written recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. The Provost will provide a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

TTF Guidelines:

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF)
APRs and EPRs for TTF shall reflect the three areas of 1) teaching, 2) scholarly/creative activity, and 3) service that are expected of all TTF in the unit. TTF are assigned 60% teaching, 30% scholarly/creative activity, and 10% service, however, a TTF may be assigned a different allocation of effort based on the needs of the program. Meeting these standards will be based upon demonstration of accomplishments in these areas as described below. Failure to meet these standards will be based upon demonstration of a lack of meeting expectations in any one of these areas as described below.

TTF members who have been assigned administrative responsibilities and/or other responsibilities as defined and agreed upon by the Department Chair and with the Dean's concurrence at the time of assignment will also have those aspects of their performance evaluated with respect to fulfilling those responsibilities.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
Teaching effectiveness by TTF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the Program, Department, College, and University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of TTF members who are under review for APR, EPR and reappointment. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, instructional development, and other contributions to student learning.

Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, TTF must create and maintain an up-to-date Teaching Dossier which contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The dossier will be used by internal reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The Department may obtain additional information from other sources so that the evidence contained in a Teaching Dossier fully and accurately reflects the domains or performance indicators applied.

Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs.
    b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
    c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in student or peer evaluations, if appropriate.
    d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
    e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.
    f. Undergraduate/Graduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment).
2. Courses Taught
    a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the possible score range as a note below the table.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.##

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
	COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%)	#.##
Overall Mean			#.##
Undergraduate Mean			#.##
Graduate Mean (if taught)			#.##

Note: Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

    b. Upload course evaluations from every course taught during the review period, including all quantitative scores and all qualitative comments.
    c. See Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment section below for required scores.
    d. Two (2) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below.
3. Evidence of instructional development
    a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in an online dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment section below for details)
    b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.
    c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.
    d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.
4. A description of Administrative Assignment(s) (if part of assignment)
    a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the administrative position.

Minimal Standards for APR, EPR, and Reappointment:
To meet the minimum standards for reappointment, TTF are expected to show evidence of the following:
1. Undergraduate Teaching/ Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):
    a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged from the preceding year (for APR) or preceding three years (for EPR), they are equal to or exceed the middle rating of the scale or instrument being used (e.g., ≥3.0 on a 5-point scale instrument), with the exception for candidates in their first year of teaching who are expected to have a minimum of 2.5 on a 5-point scale.

b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching.
    c. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least two additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of two documents are required and not two for Undergraduate and another two for Graduate classes).
2. Peer Evaluation
    a. Obtain one (1) peer review for APR and three (3) peer reviews for EPR using the PAH peer review form with an overall/aggregate score of 2.0
    b. Peer evaluations should be performed by faculty or faculty administrators who have completed two years of instruction.
    c. At least one evaluation should be completed from within BUFM's program area.
3. Instructional Development
    a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses (for APR), or at least one syllabus from each of the preceding three years for EPR.
    b. Evidence of instructional development using at least one of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.
4. Significant Contributions to Student Learning
    a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.
    b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.
    c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:
        i. academic advising services provided to students;
        ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;
        iii. coordination of comprehensive examinations;
        iv. participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
        v. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List
1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).
2. Unsolicited letters from students.
3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.
4. forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses.
7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching (after year three when no longer required).

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activity
Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all TTF members. The review of scholarly/creative activity will take into consideration both quantity and quality of productivity. TTF members should maintain a record of their scholarly/creative activity that addresses the following:

1. (Required) Scholarly/Creative Activities
   a. Submit an average of at least one (1) peer-reviewed article per year. There is an expectation that scholarly manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals will be available in the initial 3-year EPR with continued evidence of scholarly/creative activity across subsequent APR reviews.
   b. Submit at least one (1) external grant application during the initial EPR.
   c. At least one (1) presentation (poster or platform) at a national meeting sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline in the initial 3-yr EPR.
   d. After the initial EPR, one (1) item from the Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities list below is required for continued evidence of scholarly/creative work across each subsequent APR review.

2. Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities.
   a. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.
   b. Patents, intellectual property, or licensing consistent with the candidate's academic areas of specialization may count as a maximum of two refereed publications (or equivalent) toward the evaluation of the candidate's research/creative activity performance in recommendations for tenure and promotion.
   c. Unfunded research proposals (internal and external).
   d. Research funds awarded.
   e. Book Chapters.
   f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.
   g. Presentations (poster or platform) at national, state, regional or local meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.
   h. Professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop research skills.
   i. Community outreach with evaluation component. Scholarship of community engagement activities may include production of research reports for agencies (funded or not funded), completion of evaluations of programs, and development of policies and procedures at the request of agencies.

III. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. TTF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or to the profession.

TTF seeking reappointment shall provide evidence of appropriate service that falls into the following two levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service).

In presenting their records of service, TTF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions. Candidates will do this by including:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Narrative that describes service philosophy and involvement.
    b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
    c. Candidates shall include at least four (4) total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
    d. TTF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service or administrative work.

Required Service Artifacts:
1. (Required) Participation in one PAH/Program Committee.
2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the TTF members expertise.
3. (Required) Please choose two (2) from the following to achieve the required four pieces of evidence:
    a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.
    b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
    c. Advisor for student organizations.
    d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.
    e. Supervision of guided research.
    f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
    g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
    h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
    i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
    j. Community service pertaining to the TTF members area of expertise.
    k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

<u>Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials</u>

All TTF are required to submit materials in support of the APR and EPR by the established deadlines. Both APR and EPR shall require that the TTF compile a dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching scholarly/creative activity and service. All dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in the APR for TTF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness
5. Evidence of service effectiveness

Evidence considered in the EPR for TTF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness
5. Evidence of service effectiveness
6. Copies of annual performance reviews since initial appointment.

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.

<u>Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process</u>
APRs shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with this Reappointment Tenure and Promotion Policy. In cases where the TTF has been assigned a faculty mentor as part of the Success Plan, the Chair may consult with that mentor for input to the APR. EPR will be reviewed by the CHHS committee for RPT. Eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process shall vote on EPR. The eligible voters shall provide a written recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review; Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Please review the CBA and discuss with your Department Chair if you would like to apply early for promotion.

Teaching effectiveness by tenured faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the Program, Department, College, and University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of TTF members who are under review for tenure. The Teaching Dossier will be used by internal reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):

1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
   a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs.
   b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
   c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in evaluations, if appropriate.
   d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
   e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.
   f. Undergraduate/Graduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment).
2. Courses Taught
   a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the score range.
   b. Upload course evaluations from all courses, including both quantitative scores and qualitative comments.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Overall Mean **Undergraduate Mean** **Graduate Mean (if taught)**			#.## #.## #.##

Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

   c. See Minimal Standards for Tenure and Promotion section below for required scores.
   d. Three (3) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below.
3. Evidence of instructional development

        a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in online Dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for Tenure and Promotion section below for details).

        b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses

        c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.

        d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

4. Administrative Assignment (if part of assignment)

        a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the position.

Minimal Standards for Tenure and Promotion:

To meet the minimum standards for promotion, TTF are expected to show evidence of the following:

1. Undergraduate Teaching/ Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):

        a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged for the preceding six years, are equal to or exceed a 3.0 score on a 5-point scale instrument.

        b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching.

        c. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least three additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of three documents are required and not three for Undergraduate and another three for Graduate classes) from the previous six (6) years.

2. Instructional Development

        a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses.

        b. Evidence of instructional development using at least one of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.

3. Significant Contributions to Student Learning

        a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.

        b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.

        c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:

            i. academic advising services provided to students;

            ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;

            iii. coordination of comprehensive examinations;

            iv. participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;

            v. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List

1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).

2. Unsolicited letters from students.

3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.

4. Forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses).
7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching.

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activity
Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all TTF members. The review of scholarly/creative activity will take into consideration both quantity and quality of productivity. TTF members should maintain a record of their scholarly/creative activity that addresses the following performance indicators used for evaluation:

1. (Required) Scholarly/Creative Activities
    a. A minimum of four (4) publications in peer-reviewed journals.
    b. Submit at least one (1) external grant application (as principal investigator or co-investigator).
    c. A minimum of four (4) presentations (poster or platform) at a national, state, or local meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.
    d. A minimum of two (2) artifacts from the Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities list below.

2. Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities
    a. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.
    b. Patents, intellectual property, licensing consistent with the candidate's academic areas of specialization may count as a maximum of two refereed publications (or equivalent) toward the evaluation of the candidate's research/creative activity performance in recommendations for tenure and promotion.
    c. Unfunded research proposals (internal and external)
    d. Research funds awarded.
    e. Book Chapters.
    f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.
    g. Presentations (poster or platform) at national, state, regional or local meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.
    h. Professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop research skills.

i. Community outreach with evaluation component. Scholarship of community engagement activities may include production of research reports for agencies (funded or not funded), completion of evaluations of programs, and development of policies and procedures at the request of agencies.

4. Reputation within the Discipline
One indicator of the quality of a TTF member's scholarly/creative activity is reputation within the discipline. In the case of tenure, this quality will be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the Department from authoritative reviewers who are external to the University. Guidelines for selection of External Reviewers follow the "University-Wide Process for Soliciting External Letters of Review for Promotion and Tenure" from the Office of the Provost/VPAA as described at the end of this document. Positive tenure consideration would be reflected in generally consistent assessments by all reviewers.

II. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. TTF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee or other similar effort) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or profession.

TTF seeking reappointment shall provide evidence of appropriate service that falls into the following two levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service).

In presenting their records of service, TTF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions. Candidates will do this by including:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)
    a. Narrative that describes service philosophy and involvement.
    b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
    c. Candidates shall include at least five (5) total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
    d. TTF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service or administrative work.

Required Service Artifacts:
1. (Required) One PAH/Program Committee.
2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the TTF members expertise.
3. (Required) Please choose three (3) from the following to achieve the required five pieces of evidence:
    a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.
    b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
    c. Advisor for student organizations.
    d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.

e. Supervision of guided research.
f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
j. Community service pertaining to the TTF members area of expertise.
k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

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

TTF members shall electronically submit all required documents according to the timeline required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Promotion shall require that the QRF compile a dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching and service. All Dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in promotion for TTF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching, Service, and Scholarly/Creative Activity Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness
5. Evidence of service effectiveness
6. Copies of annual performance reviews since initial appointment

Unit Faculty Involvement in the Tenure and Promotion Process

A request by a faculty member for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process. The eligible voters shall provide a written recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. The Provost will provide a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review, Associate Professor to Professor

Please review the CBA and discuss with your Department Chair if you would like to apply early for promotion.

I. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness by Professors is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the Program, Department, College, and University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of TTF members who are under review for, promotion. The dossier will be used by internal reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching.

Teaching Dossier Sections (Required):

1. Statement of teaching philosophy (1-3 pages)
   a. Effective teaching strategies and approaches to meeting student learning needs.
   b. Comments on your teaching strengths.
   c. Comments on how you have adjusted your teaching to address concerns and issues in evaluations, if appropriate.
   d. Description of any curricular improvements implemented.
   e. Description of how course materials align with your teaching philosophy and course objectives.
   f. Undergraduate/Graduate research topics and/or advising (if assigned or approved as part of the faculty's assignment).
2. Courses Taught
   a. Provide a table (as below) listing semester, course numbers and names, enrollment and response rate, and instructor score. Specify the score range.
   b. Upload course evaluations from all courses, including both quantitative scores and qualitative comments.

Semester	Course	Number of Students (Response Rate)	Instructor Score
Fall 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Spring 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Summer 20##	COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name COURSE #### Name	## (##.#%) ## (##.#%) ## (##.#%)	#.## #.## #.##
Overall Mean **Undergraduate Mean** **Graduate Mean (if taught)**			#.## #.## #.##

Scores are based on a XX-point Likert scale with XX=_____ (lowest) to XX=_____ (highest).

   c. See Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for required scores.
   d. Four (4) supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below.
3. Evidence of instructional development (1-2 pages)
   a. Representative syllabi from at least three courses (can be linked to courses taught in online Dossier system; see below for Minimal Standards for Promotion section below for details).
   b. Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses.

c. Professional development for course, curriculum, and/or teaching methods to improve effectiveness.
   d. Efforts undertaken to enhance teaching skills and/or to implement innovative teaching methods and/or instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.
4. Administrative Assignment (if part of assignment)
   a. Detail responsibilities and related outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness in the position.

Minimal Standards for Promotion to Professor:
To meet the minimum standards for promotion, TTF are expected to show evidence of the following:
1. Undergraduate Teaching/ Graduate Teaching (Graduate Faculty Status required):
   a. Amass student ratings of teaching such that, when they are averaged for the preceding six years, are equal to or exceed a 3.75 score on a 5-point scale instrument.
   b. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will also be examined as evidence of the student learning environment and instructor/student interactions. Consistent patterns of inattentiveness to student concerns and/or an antagonistic learning environment will be considered evidence of ineffective teaching. Evidence of effective teaching through the submission of at least four (4) additional supportive documents from the Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List below (if you teach both Undergraduate and Graduate classes, a total of four documents are required and not four for Undergraduate and another four for Graduate classes) from the previous six (6) years.
2. Instructional Development
   a. Submission of representative syllabi (or important elements) from a minimum of three different courses.
   b. Evidence of instructional development using at least two of the examples outlined in the Teaching Dossier listed above.
3. Significant Contributions to Student Learning
   a. These contributions fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction and may contribute to a large portion of the teaching assignment.
   b. The success in these activities will be evaluated based on the judgment of quality by internal peer reviewers and is based upon the information or descriptive statements submitted by the candidate.
   c. Performance indicators that may be considered include:
      i. academic advising services provided to students;
      ii. guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences;
      iii. coordination of comprehensive examinations;
      iv. participation in Program, College, Department, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
      v. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness Evidence List
1. Representative assignments from courses illustrating teaching effectiveness (exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.).
2. Unsolicited letters from students.
3. Statements from peers, clinical preceptors, or senior faculty, who can attest to the faculty teaching effectiveness.
4. Forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g., midterm teaching evaluations with statements on how the candidate used the feedback to enhance their teaching).
5. Student advising evaluations.
6. Evidence of candidate's work on curriculum development (e.g., development of new courses).

7. Description of candidate's effective supervision of independent studies, honors projects, guided research, master's projects, theses, dissertations.
8. List of teaching awards.
9. Evidence of applying innovative teaching techniques.
10. Peer review of teaching.

Failure to meet expectations in teaching will be demonstrated by lack of evidence provided to support teaching effectiveness. In addition, faculty members will be assessed as failing to meet minimum standards if they demonstrate a pattern of unacceptable practices in the classroom (e.g., being consistently late for class, being dismissive of student concerns) or in other areas related to instruction, particularly if those practices continue after meetings with supervisors that document the actions that need to be changed or improved, or are revived after a period of compliance with directions to change.

II. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activity

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all TTF members. The review of scholarly/creative activity will take into consideration both quantity and quality of productivity. TTF members should maintain a record of their scholarly/creative activity that addresses the following performance indicators used for evaluation:

1. (Required) Scholarly/Creative Activities
   a. A minimum of six (6) publications in peer-reviewed journals since their last review from Assistant to Associate Professor.
   b. Successful funding award for at least one (1) external grant (as principal or co-principal investigator) since their last promotion.
   c. A minimum of four (4) presentations (poster or platform) at a national, state, or local meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline since their last promotion. Additional publications or equivalent may be used in place of peer-reviewed presentations.
   d. A minimum of two (2) artifacts from the Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities list below.

2. Supplemental Research Outcomes and Activities
   a. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.
   b. Patents, intellectual property, licensing consistent with the candidate's academic areas of specialization may count as a maximum of two refereed publications (or equivalent) toward the evaluation of the candidate's research/creative activity performance in recommendations for tenure and promotion.
   c. Unfunded research proposals (internal and external)
   d. Research funds awarded.
   e. Book Chapters
   f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.
   g. Presentations (poster or platform) at national, state, regional or local meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.
   h. Professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop research skills.

       i. Community outreach with evaluation component. Scholarship of community engagement activities may include production of research reports for agencies (funded or not funded), completion of evaluations of programs, and development of policies and procedures at the request of agencies.

   3. Reputation within the Discipline

      One indicator of the quality of a TTF member's scholarly/creative activity is the reputation within the discipline. This quality will be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the Department from authoritative reviewers who are external to the University. Guidelines for selection of External Reviewers follow the "University-Wide Process for Soliciting External Letters of Review for Promotion and Tenure" from the Office of the Provost/VPAA. Positive tenure consideration would be reflected in generally consistent assessments by all reviewers as described at the end of this document.

III. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness

Service contributions by faculty at the Program, Department, College, University, community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. TTF are expected to serve at all levels as assigned by the terms of their appointment. A large amount of service in one area (e.g., chair of a committee) will compensate for less or no service in other levels/areas. Faculty shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the Program, Department, College, University, community, and/or profession.

TTF seeking promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service that falls into the following two levels: internal and external. The Department defines service as internal (i.e., Program, Department, College, University) or external (i.e., community or professional service).

Candidates should show evidence of chairing or taking a leadership role in at least one committee, task force, working group, or project. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the scope and significance of their role in each service activity in their service narrative.

In presenting their records of service, TTF members must include documentation that provides evidence of their activities and contributions. Candidates will do this by including:

Service Dossier Sections (Required):
1. Statement of service philosophy (1-3 pages)
   a. Narrative that describes service philosophy and involvement.
   b. Narrative explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness via descriptions of each submitted piece of evidence (see following sections for required artifacts).
   c. Candidates shall include at least <u>six</u> (6) total pieces of evidence of service effectiveness.
   d. TTF shall note when course releases and/or stipends were included as compensation for service or administrative work.

Required Service Artifacts:
1. (Required) One PAH/Program Committee.
2. (Required) Involvement or membership in one professional organization related to the TTF members expertise.
3. (Required) Leadership role in at least one committee, task force, working group, or project.
4. (Required) Please choose four (4) activities from the following list to achieve six total pieces of service evidence:
   a. Active participation on one or more additional PAH, CHHS, or University committees.

b. Involvement in state or national professional organizations that goes beyond membership and attending conferences.
c. Advisor for student organizations.
d. Advisor or Faculty Mentor for students.
e. Supervision of guided research.
f. Coordination of PAH department programs.
g. Participation in Program, College, School, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
h. Significant contribution to PAH, admissions, curriculum, student affairs, clinical education, scholarly/creative activities, or faculty development.
i. Significant contribution to University-related events (beyond attendance).
j. Community service pertaining to the TTF members area of expertise.
k. Evidence of mentoring new faculty members.

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

TTF members shall electronically submit all required documents according to the timeline required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Promotion shall require that the QRF compile a dossier consisting of the candidate's curriculum vita (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of teaching and service. All dossiers should be presented without grammatical or mechanical errors.

Evidence considered in promotion for TTF will include:
1. Current CV in BGSU format
2. Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity and Service Dossiers
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness
4. Evidence of scholarly/creative activity effectiveness
5. Evidence of service effectiveness
6. Copies of annual performance reviews or copies of annual performance reviews (merit) from previous six years or last promotion period, inclusive of the current academic year

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.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the Tenure and Promotion Process

A request by a faculty member for promotion shall be evaluated by the eligible voters of the academic unit according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement process. The eligible voters shall provide a written recommendation to the PAH Department Chair. The Department Chair will then submit a recommendation letter to the Dean of CHHS who will submit an independent recommendation to the Provost. Faculty members have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal letter within three business days after a recommendation is forwarded to the Dean and/or after a recommendation is forwarded to the Provost. The Provost will provide a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

Approved by:

Carrie Hamady
Department Chair, Public and Allied Health   Date   08/13/2024

Jane R Liesla
Dean, Health and Human Services   Date   08/13/2024

Glenn Davis
Interim Provost and Senior Vice President   Date   08/13/2024

PAH RTP Policy August 2024

Final Audit Report   2024-08-13

Created:	2024-08-13
By:	Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAbi74Ypt0d5FcZUvE0RrSGc-xeRvVEgU9

"PAH RTP Policy August 2024" History

Document created by Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
2024-08-13 - 3:03:54 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.110.137

Document emailed to Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu) for signature
2024-08-13 - 3:08:07 PM GMT

Email viewed by Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu)
2024-08-13 - 4:42:10 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.136.179

Document e-signed by Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2024-08-13 - 4:42:53 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.136.179

Document emailed to James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu) for signature
2024-08-13 - 4:42:55 PM GMT

Email viewed by James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu)
2024-08-13 - 4:49:24 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.193.228

Document e-signed by James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2024-08-13 - 6:31:46 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.193.228

Document emailed to Glenn Davis (gmdavis@bgsu.edu) for signature
2024-08-13 - 6:31:49 PM GMT

Document e-signed by Glenn Davis (gmdavis@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2024-08-13 - 9:50:49 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.110.33

Agreement completed.
2024-08-13 - 9:50:49 PM GMT