Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

School of Counseling, Higher Education, Leadership and Foundations

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 director and dean. The workload allocation for each year under review must be documented in dossiers submitted for APRs and EPRs. Documented adjustments to workload allocations must be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas must 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 should be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period should 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 (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

        (1) A teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature

        (2) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

            (a) A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

            (b) How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

            (c) Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

    b. Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting area(s) listed below. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below.

    c. For all APRs and EPRs, indicators (1)–(3) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

(1)   Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. Elements (a) and (b) should be included in a single PDF document:

    (a) 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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

    (b) A sample assignment, assessment, or other document that demonstrates clearly communicated expectations and feedback to help improve student learning.

    (c) Self-reflection to enhance instruction should be included in the discussion of this artifact within the teaching narrative.

(2)   Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

    (a) In the first two years, a total of 3 peer observations are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching is required each year. Reviews should be assigned by the director or designee. An improving trend and/or an average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

    (b) Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section B. A mean score of 3.50 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

    (c) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period.

(3)   Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

    (a) Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

    (b) Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

(c) Evidence of student advising outside of the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(4) Description of course revisions to 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).

(5) Documentation of significant supervision of independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students.

(6) Description and documentation of full approval for a new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.

(7) 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.

(8) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(9) Articles, proceedings, and/or presentations pertaining to teaching.

(10) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.

(11) Leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.

(12) 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.

(13) Service as peer evaluator of teaching

(14) Evidence of leadership in teaching that contributes to student success, faculty development, and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence).

(15) 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. Beginning with the second APR and for the EPRs, a narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (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 maintenance of high-quality, 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

(3)   An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria; at least three and no more than five performance indicators must be included in the dossier

b.   Faculty seeking reappointment through APRs and EPRs shall provide evidence of meaningful service to the university community. The school defines service as performance of program/division, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: (1) involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance within BGSU, (2) professional expertise shared with the external community, and (3) contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should 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 contributions.

c.   Faculty service is critical for the operation of a program/division, school, college, university, and the larger profession. However, minor participation across several levels does not define a quality service record. Given a workload allocation of 20% service, for each APR faculty shall document at least two impactful contributions to one's program/division, school, college, university and/or professional community. For the EPR, faculty shall document impactful service across multiple domains 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 will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. Service as graduate or undergraduate program/division coordinator (Indicator (1)) fulfills all service obligations for that year, superseding requirements for additional service. Service for which a faculty member has received additional compensation may be included but must be identified as such. Compensated service may account for no more than 20% of the overall service record. Potential performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) of service include:

(1)   Graduate or undergraduate program/division coordinator (including appointment to the EDHD Faculty Leadership Council)

(2)   Administrative role such as course coordinator, 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 (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) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., service as program coordinator or assistant director, chairing a standing committee, leading curriculum revisions)

(10) Leading a project at the college or university level

(11) Serving on a committee or holding an elected office in a local, or state professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise

(12) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university

(13) External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching; with a written agreement from the school director and endorsement of the dean, external community service related to the discipline may be considered service

(14) 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 QRF APR and EPR materials must be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents should 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 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 (Note: Selected artifacts must be discussed and supported within each narrative)

6. A table of quantitative student teaching evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X
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 will be notified when materials are submitted and have opportunity to provide comments to the APR committee.

2. The APR committee will consist of the the candidate's mentor and two additional eligible unit faculty – one from the candidate's program/division and one not in the candidate's program/division.

3. In a letter uploaded to the current submission platform, the APR Committee shall provide detailed feedback on the candidate's progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for the next EPR.

4. No vote is taken or recorded for the APR.

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

1. Criteria used for promotion review for 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 director and dean. The workload allocation for each year under review must be documented in dossiers submitted for promotion reviews. Documented adjustments to workload allocations must be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas must be included in the portfolio. Promotion requires standards and criteria to be met in teaching and service.

2. Appointment as, or promotion to, QRF-associate professor requires consistent achievement in teaching and service and notable improvement in areas of concern highlighted in prior reviews. Appointment as, or promotion to, QRF-professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness and sustained and substantial service contributions. Promotion requires standards and criteria to be met in both teaching and service.

3. As appropriate, candidates for promotion to QRF-associate professor and QRF-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 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.

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

   a. Teaching

      (1) 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 (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

         (a) A teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature

         (b) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

            I. A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

            II. How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

            III. Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

(2)   Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting area(s) listed below. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below.

(3)   For promotion to QRF-associate professor, indicators (a)–(c) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

   (a) Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. Elements (a) and (b) should be included in a single PDF document:

       I.   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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

       II.   A sample assignment, assessment, or other document that demonstrates clearly communicated expectations and feedback to help improve student learning.

       III. Self-reflection to enhance instruction should be included in the discussion of this artifact within the teaching narrative.

   (b) Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

       I.   In the first two years, a total of 3 peer observations are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching is required each year. Reviews should be assigned by the director or designee. An improving trend and/or an average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

       II.   Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section E. A mean score of 3.50 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

       III. Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period.

   (c) Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

      I.   Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

      II.   Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

      III.   Evidence of student advising outside of the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(4)   At least two additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section A.4.c.(4)—(15).

b. Service

(1)   A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (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 maintenance of high quality, 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

(c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria; at least three and no more than five performance indicators must be included in the dossier

(2)   For promotion to QRF-associate professor, faculty shall document impactful service across multiple domains with an average of at least two service activities per year across all years in the period under review.

(3)   At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section A.5.c.(1)—(14).

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

a. Teaching

(1)   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 (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

(a) A teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature;

(b) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

    I.   A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

    II.   How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

    III.   Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

(2) Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting area(s) listed below. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. For promotion, indicators (a)–(c) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

(a) Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

    I.   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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

    II.   Sample student assignments, assessments, and other materials that demonstrate clearly communicated expectations and quality feedback that align with the teaching narrative.

    III.   A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (i.e., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback.

(b) Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

    I.   Peer evaluations from the period under review including a minimum of 3 over the last six years. An average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

IV. Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section E. A mean score of 3.75 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

II. Student 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.

(c) Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

I. Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

II. Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

III. Evidence of student advising outside the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(d) At least two additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section A.4.c.(4)—(15), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in teaching. Leadership in teaching that will be considered for promotion to professor includes:

I. Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.

II. Leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.

III. 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.

IV. Service as peer evaluator of teaching

V. Evidence of leadership in teaching that contributes to student success, faculty development, and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence).

b. Service

    (2)   A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (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 maintenance of high quality, 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

        (c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria; at least three and no more than five performance indicators must be included in the dossier

    (3)   For promotion to QRF-professor, faculty shall document impactful service across multiple domains with an average of at least two service activities per year across all years in the period under review, plus documentation of at least two leadership roles in service. Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to QRF-professor includes:

        (a) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., service as program coordinator or assistant director, 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.

    (4)   At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section A.5.c.(1)—(14).

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

All required QRF promotion materials must be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents should 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 and EPR letters from 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 (Note: Selected artifacts must be discussed and supported within each narrative)

6. A table of quantitative student teaching evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X
			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 Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) of Tenure-track Faculty (TTF)

1. Criteria used for APR and EPR of TTF evaluate teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The workload allocation approved by the director and dean for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for each year under review must be documented in dossiers submitted for APRs and EPRs. Documented adjustments to workload allocations must be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas must 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 the EPR, any concerns expressed in the previous reviews should be addressed and a pattern of improvement over the three-year period should 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 (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

      (1) A teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature

      (2) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

         (a) A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

         (b) How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

         (c) Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

   b. Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting area(s). Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below.

   c. For all APRs and the EPR, indicators (1)–(3) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

      (1) Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. Elements (a) and (b) should be included in a single PDF document:

(a) 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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

(b) A sample assignment, assessment, or other document that demonstrates clearly communicated expectations and quality feedback that aligns with the teaching narrative.

(c) Self-reflection to enhance instruction should be included in the discussion of this artifact within the teaching narrative.

(2) Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

(a) In the first two years, a total of 3 peer observations are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching is required each year. Reviews should be assigned by the school director or designee. An improving trend and/or an average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

(b) Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section G. A mean score of 3.50 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

(c) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period.

(3) Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

(a) Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

(b) Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

(c) Evidence of student advising outside the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(4)   Description of course revisions to 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).

(5)   Documentation of significant supervision of independent studies and other uncompensated teaching (e.g., directed readings/research) offered to students.

(6)   Description and documentation of full approval for a new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.

(7)   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.

(8)   Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(9)   Articles, proceedings, and/or presentations pertaining to teaching. Artifacts used here cannot also be used in the scholarly/creative activity area.

(10) Full approval of new course, substantial course modification, new program, or substantial program modification.

(11) Leadership of a learning community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.

(12) 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.

(13) Service as peer evaluator of teaching

(14) Evidence of leadership in teaching that contributes to student success, faculty development, and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence).

(15) 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. This is demonstrated by the documentation of the prestige of the setting and the impact of the

work on others in the discipline. In the CV and the narrative, faculty members should provide evidence of quality and context of publications (e.g., acceptance rate, impact factor, citations count, publisher, intended audience of publication).

c. Co-authored publications are equivalent to single author publications, but faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of the publication.

d. In-press publications are considered published, but faculty members must provide supporting documentation of submission and acceptance of the final manuscript.

e. Faculty are encouraged (but not required) to engage in activities that advance the public dissemination and understanding of scholarly/creative activity by the broader public and the practitioners whose work is often the research focus. To that end, media-based and other public-facing scholarly/creative activities may be an important aspect of a faculty member's agenda by helping inform a broader public of their research findings (e.g., participation in a podcast; editorials on local, state, or national issues; guest blog postings; radio or television interviews; publication in practitioner periodicals; and expert witness testimony in legislative or judicial hearings).

f. For APRs and the EPR, a narrative that demonstrates successful progress toward meeting expectations for tenure and promotion in scholarly/creative activity (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

   (1) A description of the scholarly/creative activity agenda

   (2) A description of maintenance of high-quality or improvement in scholarly/creative activity over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed

   (3) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation indexes); 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 must include the scholarly/creative activity narrative plus at least two primary or secondary indicators of research activity.

   (2) For the second APR, faculty members must include the scholarly/creative activity narrative, and 4-5 performance indicators, including at least two refereed publications under review, in press, or published.

   (3) For the EPR, faculty members must include the scholarly/creative activity narrative and five indicators of research activity as detailed below.

      (a) A published or in press peer-reviewed journal article, book, book chapter, or creative product

      (b) A second artifact must be another primary indicator from the list below

(c) The remaining three indicators may be primary or secondary indicators from the list below

(4) Primary indicators of scholarly effectiveness

(a) Published peer-reviewed journal article, book*, book chapter, or creative product (document peer review process for books, book chapters, and creative products); manuscripts under peer review may be used for the first and second APR
*Single authored, scholarly books will count for two publications; an explanation of the publishing and review process must be included in the narrative

(b) Funded competitive external grant of $15,000 or greater

(c) A collection of five (5) public-facing research contributions (See Section F.5.e. for definition)

(5) Secondary indicators of scholarly effectiveness

(a) Peer-reviewed presentation, poster, or workshop at a regional, national, and international conference

(b) Funded internal grant

(c) Unfunded external grant (for APR and EPR only)

(d) Refereed proceedings

(e) Published non-refereed academic book or book chapter (self-published manuscripts not acceptable)

(f) Published book review in peer-reviewed journal

(g) Peer reviewed conference proceedings or symposia

(h) Journal editor

(i) Associate editor/guest editor of peer reviewed journal

(j) Invited presentation at local, state, regional, national, or international conference; invited presentations and keynotes may provide evidence of a national or international reputation, but do not substitute for peer reviewed publications and presentations

(k) Encyclopedia chapter

(l) Scholarly or creative activity awards

(m) Public-facing research contributions not included in Section F.5.e.

(n) Evidence of contributions to the public good through scholarly/creative activities (provide supporting evidence and explain in the 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, a narrative that demonstrates

successful progress in service (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 maintenance of high quality, 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

(3) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria; at least three and no more than five performance indicators must 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 of program/division, school, college, university, and professional activities that fall into three domains: (1) involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance within BGSU, (2) professional expertise shared with the external community, and (3) contributions to a faculty member's professional field. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation that provides evidence of their 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 other forms of relevant documentation of contributions.

c. Faculty service is critical for the operation of a program, school, college, university, and the larger profession. However minor participation across several levels does not define a quality service record. Given a workload allocation of 20% service, for each APR faculty shall document make at least two impactful contributions to one's program/division, school, college university and/or professional community. For the EPR, faculty shall document impactful service across at multiple domains 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 graduate or undergraduate program/division coordinator (Indicator (1)) fulfills all service obligations for that year, superseding requirements for additional service. Service for which a faculty member has received additional compensation may be included but must be identified as such. Compensated service may account for no more than 20% of the overall service record. Potential performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) of service include:

(1) Graduate or undergraduate program/division coordinator (including appointment to the EDHD Faculty Leadership Council)

(2) Administrative role such as course coordinator, 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 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) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., service as program coordinator or assistant director, chairing a major committee, leading curriculum revisions)

(10) Leading a significant project at the college or university level

(11) Serving on a committee or holding an elected office in a local, or state professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise

(12) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university

(13) External community service (e.g., to support community organizations, projects, and programs) relevant to a faculty member's teaching. With a written agreement from the school director and endorsement of the dean, external community service related to the discipline may substitute for college or university service

(14) 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 must be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents should 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 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 (Note: Artifacts must be discussed and supported within narratives)

6. A table of quantitative student teaching evaluations for the period under review in this format:

Semester and Year	Course Prefix & Number	# Students Enrolled	# Respondents	Course Mean on Items X-X
			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 will be notified when materials are submitted and have opportunity to provide comments to the APR committee.

2. The APR committee will consist of the candidate's mentor and two additional eligible unit faculty – one from the candidate's program/division and one not in the candidate's program/division.

3. In a letter uploaded to the current submission platform, the APR Committee shall provide detailed feedback on the candidate's progress toward meeting the criteria and standards for the next EPR.

4. 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 must be documented in dossiers submitted for tenure and/or promotion reviews. Documented adjustments to workload allocations must be taken into consideration during the review process. Evidence of productivity in the assigned areas must 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, sustained and substantial achievement in scholarly/creative activity, 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 (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

         (a) A teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature

         (b) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

            I. A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

            II. How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

            III. Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

      (2) Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting

area(s) listed below. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below.

(3) For all tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, indicators (1)–(3) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

(a) Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

   I. 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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

   II. A sample assignment, assessment, or other document that demonstrates clearly communicated expectations and feedback to help improve student learning.

   III. Self-reflection to enhance instruction should be included in the discussion of this artifact within the teaching narrative.

(b) Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

   I. In the first two years, a total of 3 peer observations are required. In years 3-6, at least one peer evaluation of teaching is required each year. Reviews should be assigned by the director or designee. An improving trend and/or an average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

   II. Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section J. A mean score of 3.50 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

   III. Student 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.

(c) Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

   I. Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

II. Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

III. Evidence of student advising outside the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(d) At least two additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section F.4.c.(4)—(15).

(4) External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate 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. Reputation within the discipline shall be judged primarily by external reviewers. The process for selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's Office.

b. Scholarly/Creative Activity

(1) Evaluation of scholarly/creative activity shall be guided by the principles outlined in Section F.5.a-g.

(2) A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in scholarly/creative activity (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required:

(a) A description of the scholarly/creative activity agenda

(b) A description of maintenance of high-quality or improvement in scholarly/creative activity over the year(s) under review, including how concerns expressed in previous reviews (if any) have been addressed

(c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation indexes); 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

(d) Faculty shall have at least five high quality, scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles, books*, book chapters, or creative products (document peer review process for books, book chapters, and creative products). One externally funded grant of $15,000 or greater may be substituted for one publication. A collection of 5 public-facing research contributions may also be a substitute for one publication.
*Single authored, scholarly books may count for two publications. Explanation of publishing and review process must be included in the narrative.

(e) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.5.g.(4)-(5).

c. Service

(1) A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements in required:

(a) Philosophy of or approach to service activities

(b) A description of maintenance of high quality 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

(c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.

(2) For tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, faculty shall document impactful service across multiple domains with an average of at least two service activities per year across all years in the period under review.

(3) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.6.c.(1)—(14).

6. Criteria and Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

a. Teaching

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

(a) a teaching philosophy statement grounded in relevant professional literature;

(b) An explanation of each performance indicator (i.e., artifacts and previous reviews) in the dossier and how they illustrate teaching effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria including:

  I. A self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness that provides evidence of measures used (e.g., midterm evaluations) and changes made based on feedback

  II. How concerns expressed in previous reviews and peer and student evaluations of teaching (if any) have been addressed and improved upon

  III. Reflective analysis of the student qualitative comments included in the second teaching artifact

(2) Most of the teaching evaluation will occur through three major categories: (1) classroom artifacts, (2) evaluations by students and peers, and (3) advising. These categories will comprise the majority of the evaluation of teaching (each category considered equally). The remaining consideration will come from other supporting

area(s) listed below. Performance indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below.

(3) For promotion to professor, indicators (a)–(c) are required. Up to two additional indicators may be included in the dossier.

(a) Classroom artifacts should provide evidence of clear expectations for students, feedback to help improve student learning, and self-reflection by the faculty member to enhance instruction. Elements (a) and (b) should be included in a single PDF document:

   I. 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. A sample syllabus is available from the Center for Faculty Excellence.

   II. A sample assignment, assessment, or other document that demonstrates clearly communicated expectations and feedback to help improve student learning.

   III. Self-reflection to enhance instruction should be included in the discussion of this artifact within the teaching narrative.

(b) Evaluations by peers and students are tools that should help inform improvement within teaching. This self-reflection should be evident within the teaching narrative. The following elements should be included in a single PDF document:

   I. Peer evaluations from the period under review including at least 3 from the last 6 years. An average rating of *satisfactory* is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

   II. Table of student course evaluation scores from all semesters under review, in format displayed in Section J. A mean score of 3.75 is one indicator of teaching effectiveness.

   III. Student 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.

(c) Supporting students as an advisor is a key role faculty play in student success. Faculty members shall provide the following elements for review (in a single PDF document) and provide reflection on their advising work within the narrative. If advising is not part of assigned teaching duties, these elements are not required. If a faculty member does not have (a) and/or (b) as part of their assigned duties, they are exempt from the expectation and should address only (c) below.

   I. Table of advisees, undergraduate and graduate, that indicates progress towards graduation.

   II. Service as chair or committee member on completed graduate program milestone and culminating experiences (e.g., thesis, dissertation, proposal

defense, preliminary/comprehensive exam, capstone), and/or honors project committees. 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.

    III.   Evidence of student advising outside the formal or assigned advisor role that contributes to student success.

(4)   At least two additional indicators of teaching effectiveness as described in Section F.4.c.(4)—(15), including documentation of at least two leadership roles in teaching. Leadership in teaching that will 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) Service as peer evaluator of teaching

    (e) Evidence of leadership in teaching that contributes to student success, faculty development, and/or institutional innovation (provide supporting evidence).

b. Scholarly/Creative Activity

(1)   A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in scholarly/creative activity (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements is required.

    (a) A description of the research agenda

    (b) A description of maintenance of high quality 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

    (c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including indicators of quality (e.g., citation indexes); 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.

(2)   Faculty shall have a steady record of productivity, including at least six high quality, scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles, books*, book chapters, or creative products (document peer review process for books, book chapters, and creative products) within the prior six-year period. One externally funded grant of $15,000 or greater may be substituted for one publication. A collection of 5 public-facing research contributions may also be a substitute for one publication.

* Single authored, scholarly books will count for two publications. An explanation of the publishing and review process must be included in the narrative.

(3) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.5.g.(4)-(5).

(4) External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking promotion to 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 reputation. Candidates for promotion to professor shall have evidence of a positive national and/or international reputation. Reputation 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 will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's Office.

c. Service

(1) A narrative that demonstrates successful progress in service (no more than five single-spaced pages) consisting of the following elements in required:

(a) Philosophy of or approach to service activities

(b) A description of maintenance of high quality 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

(c) An explanation of the performance indicators (i.e., artifacts) in the dossier, including how they illustrate service effectiveness and meet stated standards and criteria.

(2) For promotion to professor, faculty shall document impactful service across multiple domains with an average of at least two service activities per year across all years in the period under review, including documentation of at least two leadership roles in service. Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to professor includes:

(a) Evidence of leadership at the school level (e.g., service as program coordinator or assistant director, 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.

(3) At least three and no more than five performance indicators as described in Section F.6.c.(1)—(14).

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

All required TTF tenure and promotion materials must be submitted by published deadlines into the designated submission system. All submitted materials shall be of professional quality and free of errors. All documents should 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. For tenure and promotion to associate professor candidates, prior annual review and enhanced performance review letters from director and dean. For promotion to professor, include only the dean and provost letter recommending 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 Note: Selected artifacts must be discussed and supported within each narrative

6. A table of quantitative student teaching evaluations for the period under review in this format:

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

Approved by:

Patrick Pauken

03/29/2024

Director, School of Counseling, Higher Education, Leadership, and Foundations | Date

Dawn Shinew (Apr 1, 2024 09:41 EDT)

04/01/2024

Dean, College of Education and Human Development | Date

Joe Whitehead (Apr 1, 2024 22:36 EDT)

04/01/2024

Provost and Senior Vice President | Date