Preamble: The purposes of this document are: A) to guide and assist faculty and their academic units in the development of merit, contract renewal, promotion and tenure policies; B) to promote, protect, and ensure that the policies and processes so delineated reflect the autonomy and unique characteristics of the academic units; C) to assure that faculty personnel processes are reflective of the current BGSU vision statement; D) to assure that internal faculty peer review and judgment which lie at the core of our values are maintained in reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit decisions; E) to ensure that all faculty experience fair, equitable and consistent processes in the evaluations that take place at their career mileposts, and F) to ensure that the relevant sections of the Academic Charter are followed.

DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED AND PROBATIONARY FACULTY FOR THE PURPOSES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT

School of Teaching and Learning
College of Education and Human Development
Bowling Green State University

I. Department Policy

The Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction explains by means of this policy statement the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the annual evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit. This statement complies with the policies of the Board of Trustees of Bowling Green State University, the Academic Charter, and the College of Education and Human Development. This statement is provided to all faculty in the department upon request or annually and a copy is maintained in the department office. It has been approved by the faculty of the department in accord with department policies.

A. Departmental Philosophy

The reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit processes starts at the point at which a faculty member signs a probationary employment contract. Decisions regarding reappointment, granting of tenure, granting of promotion to higher rank and merit are the most important decisions that we can make. As such, they must be based upon a longitudinal and continuous process that includes support, evaluation, and feedback.

---

1 This document was approved by the Faculty Senate on April 15, 1997. The procedural portions of this document (found in I-B of the Academic Charter) may be amended by the Faculty Senate when the document entitled “Review Process for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion of Tenured and Probationary Faculty” prepared by the Task Force on Tenure Promotion and Merit and the Faculty Welfare Committee is debated at future meetings of the Faculty Senate.
When we hire a faculty member, we are operating under a number of assumptions. First, we are committing resources (personnel and time) to this faculty member because he or she will be meeting expressed needs of the academic unit. Second, we expect that these needs can be met through the actualization of an agenda that includes teaching, service, and research/creative activities. Third, once a faculty member achieves standards of performance that meet criterion levels for tenure and promotion, we expect that he or she will be granted tenure and promotion.

We have a special obligation to non-tenured probationary faculty to involve them in the tenure and promotion process from the date of employment. This requires the provision of support, evaluation, and feedback. The individual should not leave these feedback sessions with any doubt regarding his/her performance with respect to meeting performance standards. Expectations for faculty performance must be communicated accurately and such communication should include a mentoring component. It is extremely important that any mentor be a demonstrable model of the expected performance standards.

Teaching, research, and service should not be looked upon as separate, fundamental activities of faculty. Teaching, research, and service must be viewed as complementary; as demonstrated excellence in one contributes to excellence in the other.

Scholarship has been defined in various ways. For example, Boyer envisions scholarship from four different perspectives (i.e., discovery, application, integration, and sharing). Regardless of the definition, however, it is appropriate that individuals may choose to demonstrate expertise in a given area or engage in scholarship variance in order to make an informed choice as to what type of scholarship they wish to emphasize. For this reason, non-tenured probationary faculty may be involved in the widest possible variance of scholarship. Once tenure and promotion are granted, and given these broad experiences, these newly tenured faculty will be in a better position to adjust their professional behaviors to both personal and academic unit goals. They will also be in a better position to change emphases as academic unit and institutional missions are modified.

Given the above position statements, candidates for tenure should simultaneously be candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor, and tenure should not be granted unless the individual has met performance standards required for promotion to the associate professor rank. Individuals who are candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor rank should display a reasonable balance of achievements in teaching, research, and service. Such achievements should be continuous and consistent in nature.

Individuals who are candidates for promotion to full professor should demonstrate scholarship that is more focused and clearly at a more rigorous level than that displayed by the individual when he or she was promoted to the rank of associate professor. An individual seeking promotion to full professor will likely exhibit scholarship that is somewhat less variant than that exhibited earlier by the individual. The specific focus of the scholarship should be readily discernible, and the scholarship should be significant and have an impact. Significance and impact can be determined through peers’ analyses of one’s scholarship. However, the individual should not lose sight of
the fact that, in addition to continuous scholarship, he/she should also demonstrate continuous contributions to teaching, and service.

B. Vision Statement

The department recognizes that in matters relating to the annual review for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit, Bowling Green State University supports performance consistent with the University’s aspiration to be the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation. As defined by the Academic Charter (Article II.A, Section A), “The persons who create and maintain the University constitute the University Community. There are five groups within this Community: students, faculty, administrators, administrative staff, and classified staff.” To achieve its objectives, the University expects faculty participation in the interdependent areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service that is of the highest quality, grounded in intellectual discovery, and guided by rational discourse and civility. The essence of this department’s evaluation process is to improve faculty member’s performance through appropriate evaluation and timely feedback. Careful and consistent application of the criteria and standards in evaluating faculty performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service are of fundamental importance in achieving the department’s mission and in protecting the rights of the individual faculty member. Department review processes are to be conducted clearly, openly, responsibly, and fairly.

C. The Academic Charter

The University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure (section B-I.C) and the statement on Evaluation of Faculty Personnel (section B-I.D.), as contained in the Academic Charter, identify the three relevant evaluation criteria as teaching, research/creative work, and service and define the basic requirements for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit, as stated in the Academic Charter (section B-I-D. 2. a.), for promotion policies “Academic units may develop more specific or more rigorous criteria in teaching, service, or scholarly activity, provided that such criteria are equitable and appropriate and provided that they do not conflict with the criteria below and, in a department/school, with the criteria of the majority of the faculty members of the academic unit.” As stated in the Academic Charter for tenure policies, section B-I.D.2.b, “Either academic units or colleges may develop more precise statements of what is expected under each criterion, but may not add other criteria.” All such statements shall be approved by the appropriate academic unit or college tenured faculties.” These criteria and standards allow for differentiation among faculty members with regard to their roles and contributions within the department in fulfillment of the department, college, and University mission.

1. Faculty Appointments

The University defines three types of faculty appointments (temporary, lecturer, and regular) and distinguishes between two types of regular appointment (probationary and tenured). Temporary and lecturer appointments are discussed in section B-I.C.2 (a) and (b) of the Academic Charter. Probationary appointments and policies associated with such appointments are described in section B-I.C.2 (c) of the Academic Charter.
which includes statements on the probationary period, the review process, and termination. Tenured appointments, and the policies associated with such appointments, are described in section B-I.C.3 of the Academic Charter, which includes statements on the meaning, obligations, and termination of tenure.

2. Annual Review for Reappointment

The Academic Charter mandates a comprehensive annual review of all temporary faculty members at section B-I.D.2.b.4, lecturers at B-I.D.2.b.5, and probationary faculty members at B-I.D.2.b.1 for the purpose of contract renewal and assigns the primary responsibility for that review to the department. The reappointment evaluation shall be based on the faculty member’s progress in teaching, research/creative endeavors, and service during the previous calendar or academic year (depending on the date of hire). This evaluation shall be communicated in writing to the probationer by the Chair (after receiving the vote and summary from the Reappointment Committee) and a copy forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development and the Provost (B-I.D.2.b.1). Notice of nonrenewal will comply with charter guidelines as indicated by the university’s notification schedule for contract decisions (B-I.C.2.c.1.d).

If negative, the annual review of a temporary, lecturer, or probationary faculty member may result in the rejection of that faculty member for reappointment. For probationary faculty members, the overriding question to be considered by the department and the dean during the annual review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure.

a) Process for Reappointment

(1) Preparation Arrangements

(a) Documents from the previous academic or calendar year (depending on date of hire) are prepared by the individual probationary faculty candidate. However, the candidate may request assistance from one of the Reappointment Committee members. For the purpose of this document the Reappointment Committee is determined to be the EDCI tenured faculty.

(b) Probationary faculty will submit materials to the EDCI Department Chair (in accordance with the university’s Reappointment Schedule). The EDCI Chair will review each set of credentials for completeness.

(c) The materials should be presented in a format consistent with the College of Education and Human Development’s tenure portfolio and include at least the following:

(i) A current resume in university format.
(ii) A letter to the tenured faculty summarizing the year under review
(iii) Evidence of progress toward tenure taken from the areas of teaching, research/creative work, service, and other appropriate evidence of productivity (see sections III, IV, V regarding evidence).

(d) These materials will be placed in a central location to be reviewed by the Reappointment Committee in the EDCI Department. An announcement will be made by the Reappointment Committee Chair, in accordance with the guidelines of the university’s notification schedule for contract decisions, to all members of the Reappointment Committee, indicating where the materials are located. Committee members must have at least two weeks to review the materials.

(2) Following the stated review period, the Chair of the Reappointment Committee will call a meeting of the Reappointment Committee for the purpose of (1) casting a vote via secret ballot for each probationary faculty member and (2) writing a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each probationary faculty member to be given to the probationary faculty member. The committee must be given at least two weeks notice of the scheduled meeting.

b) Meeting Conduct

(1) The Department Advisory Council will have elected one tenured faculty member from its membership for a term of one year. This person will call and chair the meeting(s) of the Reappointment Committee.

(2) The EDCI Chair will present his/her summary.

(3) During discussion concerning each candidate for reappointment, the candidate has the option of being present to explain the documents and/or present additional information.

(4) The Reappointment Committee will have the opportunity to discuss the materials and information presented without the candidate being present before the vote is taken.

c) Voting Procedures

(1) A separate ballot will be prepared by the chair of the Reappointment Committee for each candidate, by name, and distributed by the chair of the Reappointment Committee. The balloting options will be:
(a) Recommend renewal of contract
(b) Recommend renewal of contract with specific conditions to be met
(c) Recommend non-renewal of the contract
(d) Abstention

Abstentions will be considered a non-renewal vote.

(2) The Reappointment Committee members who are unable to attend the meeting will return their ballots to a secured voting box in the departmental office.

(3) Two tenured faculty will be appointed by the Reappointment Committee chair to count the ballots and report the results in a timely fashion.

(4) In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the Reappointment Committee chair will call a meeting for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.”

d) Decision Making

(1) The outcome necessary for a recommendation of reappointment is a two-thirds majority “yes” vote of all members of the Reappointment Committee.

(2) After the tabulation of all ballots, the Reappointment Committee chair will report the results to the EDCI chair. In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the Reappointment Committee chair will call a meeting for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.” If the result is no, the committee will report (in writing) within two working days.

(3) Following the meeting, the chair of the Reappointment Committee drafts a detailed report to the EDCI Chair, recording the committee’s vote and summarizing the discussion. Prior to its submission to the EDCI Chair, the chair of the Reappointment committee shall circulate a draft report to the members of the Reappointment Committee to assure that it reflects the majority view of the faculty.

(4) The Department Chair will inform the candidates of the outcome by written notice, delivered not more than four working days after the meeting of the Reappointment Committee.

(5) Although the vote of the faculty will not be binding upon the Chair, the vote of the faculty, the recommendation of the Chair and supporting documents will be sent to the Dean in a letter, according to policies and procedures outlined by the university.
copy of the letter will be provided to the faculty member by the EDCI Department Chair and will be placed in the EDCI personnel file of the faculty member.

3. Review for Tenure

The tenured faculty (B-I. D. 2. b. 2) in the department have the primary responsibility for evaluating probationary faculty for tenure. In addition to annual reviews, the Academic Charter at B-I. D. 2. b. mandates that a probationary faculty member be evaluated no later than the next-to-last year of the probationary appointment. “The candidate for tenure . . . shall be granted or denied tenure solely on the basis of the following criteria: teaching effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, service to the University, and attainment of the terminal degree or its professional equivalent” (B-I. D. 2. b; Appendix A). Probationary faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the probationary period. Because department and college review committees apply tenure standards without discounted expectations based on a shorter probationary period, faculty members are discouraged from seeking early tenure decisions unless there are compelling reasons for doing so.

a) Process for Tenure

(1) Preparation Arrangements

(a) Candidates for Tenure must notify the EDCI chair and EDCI’s representative to the College TPRC (in writing) that he/she is a candidate for tenure (in accordance with the university’s Tenure and Promotion Guidelines).

(b) Probationary faculty will submit materials to the EDCI Department Chair on or before a date specified by the EDCI chair. The EDCI Chair will review each set of credentials for completeness.

(c) Documents prepared under the direction of the individual probationary faculty candidate will be made available (in the office of the Chair) to the Tenure Committee (all tenured faculty in EDCI) for two weeks prior to the vote. See sections III, IV, and V for details regarding evidence.

(d) The materials should be presented in a format consistent with the College of Education and Human Development’s tenure portfolio and include at least the following:

(i) A current resume in university format.
(ii) A letter to the tenured faculty summarizing the years under review.
(iii) Evidence of progress toward tenure taken from the areas of teaching, research/creative work, service, and other appropriate evidence of productivity. (See sections III, IV, V regarding evidence.)

(2) Copies of the TPRC summary documents will be circulated among the tenured faculty prior to the vote.

(3) A meeting of the Tenure Committee will be called by the chair of the committee. Written notice of the meeting shall be delivered to the Tenure Committee at least two weeks before the meeting date. The names of all candidates for tenure shall also be listed and provided to the Tenure Committee.

b) Meeting Conduct

(1) The Department Advisory Council will have elected one tenured faculty member from its membership for a term of one year. This person will call and chair the meeting(s) of the Tenure Committee.

(2) The EDCI Chair will present his/her summary.

(3) During discussion concerning each candidate for tenure, the candidate has the option of being present to explain the documents and/or present additional information.

(4) The Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to discuss the materials and information presented without the candidate being present before the vote is taken.

c) Voting Procedures

(1) A separate ballot will be prepared by the Chair of the Tenure Committee for each candidate, by name, and distributed to the Tenure Committee by the chair of the committee. The balloting options will be a “yes” vote or a “no” vote or abstention. Abstentions will be considered a no” vote.

(2) The Tenure Committee members who are unable to attend the meeting will return their ballots to a secured voting box in the departmental office and will initial a departmental form indicating that they have voted or complete an absentee ballot.

(3) Ballots will be placed in a secured voting box and are the responsibility of the Tenure Committee chair.
Two tenured faculty will be appointed by the Tenure Committee chair to count the ballots and report the results within two working days.

In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the Tenure Committee chair will call a meeting for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.”

d) Decision Making

1. The outcome necessary for a recommendation of tenure is a two-thirds majority “yes” vote of all members of the Tenure Committee. An abstention or failure to return a ballot will be counted as a vote of “no.”

2. After the tabulation of all ballots, the Tenure Committee chair will report the results. In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the Tenure Committee chair will call a meeting for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.” If the result is no, the committee will report reasons for the “no” vote (in writing) to the Department Chair within two working days.

3. Following the meeting, the chair of the Tenure Committee will draft a detailed report to the EDCI Chair, recording the committee’s vote and summarizing the discussion. Prior to its submission to the EDCI Chair, the chair of the Tenure Committee shall circulate a draft report to the members of the Tenure Committee to assure that it reflects the majority view of the faculty.

4. The Department Chair will inform the candidates of the outcome by written notice, delivered not more than four working days after the meeting of the Tenure Committee.

5. Although the vote of the faculty will not be binding upon the Chair, the vote of the faculty, the recommendation of the chair and supporting documents will be sent to the Dean according to policies and procedures outlined by the College. A copy of the letter will be provided to the faculty member by the EDCI Department Chair and will be placed in the EDCI personnel file of the faculty member. (Academic Charter, section B-I.D.2.b.)

4. Review for Promotion

The department also has the primary responsibility for the comprehensive review of all faculty members nominated for promotion (See Appendix A). The qualifications for assistant professor, associate professor and professor are described in B-I.D.2.a.1.(b), (c), and (d) of the Academic Charter as follows:
1. Assistant Professor
   (a) shall hold a Ph.D. degree or its equivalent from an accredited college or university;
   (b) shall have evident ability as a teacher; and
   (c) shall give evidence of ability to do scholarly work or the equivalent in the creative or performing arts; and shall give evidence of exceptional contributions to the academic community or profession.

2. Associate Professor:
   (a) shall hold the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent from an accredited college or university;
   (b) shall demonstrate ability as an effective teacher;
   (c) shall have demonstrated ability to do scholarly work as indicated by publications, significant research, and presentation of refereed papers at regional or national meetings; or the equivalent in the creative or performing arts; and
   (d) shall give evidence of active involvement in service to the University community or the profession.

3. Professor:
   (a) shall hold the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent from an accredited college or university;
   (b) shall have an established reputation as an effective teacher;
   (c) shall have an established reputation within the discipline/profession as evidenced by a record of productive scholarship, significant research, or the equivalent in the creative or performing arts; and
   (d) shall give evidence of significant service to the University community or profession.

Typically, promotion to associate professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure, although formally the two processes are separate decisions. Under unusual circumstances, faculty members may be hired as associate professors without tenure, and in these cases, the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of promotion to associate professor.

University policy does not establish a mandatory point of decision for promotion to full professor. A customary waiting period is approximately equal to the interval between the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor, because significant incremental achievement is expected between ranks.

The department may stipulate criteria and standards for promotion that differentiate among the ranks with regard to their expected contributions to the department’s performance as long as those criteria and standards do not conflict with the provisions of the Academic Charter and of the College.
a) **Process for Promotion**

(1) **Preparation Arrangements**

(a) Candidates for Promotion must notify the EDCI chair and EDCI’s representative to the College TPRC in writing, that he/she is a candidate for promotion (in accordance with the university’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines).

(b) Probationary faculty will submit materials to the EDCI Department Chair on or before a date specified by the EDCI chair. The EDCI Chair will review each set of credentials for completeness.

(c) Documents prepared under the direction of the individual probationary faculty candidate will be made available (in the office of the Chair) to all faculty above the rank of assistant professor for two weeks prior to the vote (see sections III, IV, and V for details regarding evidence).

(d) The materials should be presented in a format consistent with the College of Education and Human Development’s promotion portfolio and include at least the following:

(i) A current resume in university format.
(ii) A letter to the tenured faculty summarizing the years under review.
(iii) Evidence of progress toward tenure taken from the areas of teaching, research/creative work, service, and other appropriate evidence of productivity (see sections III, IV, V regarding evidence).

(b) Copies of the TPRC summary documents will be circulated among the Promotion Committee members prior to the vote.

(c) The Promotion Committee will consist of all eligible tenured EDCI faculty as defined by the Academic Charter (B.I.C.3.a).

(d) A meeting of all Promotion Committee members will be called by the chair of the committee. Written notice of the meeting shall be delivered to all Promotion Committee members at least two weeks before the meeting date. The names of all candidates for promotion shall also be listed and provided to the Promotion Committee.
b) Meeting Conduct

(1) The Department Advisory Council will have elected one tenured faculty member from its membership for a term of one year. This person will call and chair the meeting(s) of the Promotion Committee for the purpose of voting.

(2) The EDCI Chair will present his/her summary.

(3) During discussion concerning each candidate for promotion, the candidate has the option of being present to explain the documents and/or present additional information.

(4) The Promotion Committee will have the opportunity to discuss the materials and information presented without the candidate being present before the vote is taken.

c) Voting Procedures

(1) A separate ballot will be prepared for each candidate, by name, and distributed to all Promotion Committee members. The only balloting options will be a “yes” vote or “no” vote or abstention. Abstentions will be considered a no vote.

(2) Promotion Committee members who are unable to attend the meeting will return their ballots to a secured voting box in the departmental office and will initial a departmental form indicating that they have voted.

(3) Ballots will be due by the conclusion of the meeting. Ballots will be placed in a secured voting box and are the responsibility of the Promotion Committee chair.

(4) Two Promotion Committee members will be appointed by the chair of the Promotion Committee to count the ballots and report the results within two working days.

(5) In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the Promotion Committee chair will call a meeting for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.”

d) Decision Making

(1) The outcome necessary for a recommendation of promotion is a simple majority “yes” vote of all the Promotion Committee members. An abstention or failure to return a ballot will be counted as a vote of “no.”
(2) After the tabulation of all ballots, the Promotion Committee chair will report the results. If the result is no, the group will report (in writing) reasons for the “no” vote to the Department Chair within two working days.

(3) Following the meeting, the chair of the Promotion Committee drafts a detailed report to the EDCI Chair, recording the committee’s vote and summarizing the discussion. Prior to its submission to the EDCI Chair, the chair of the Promotion Committee shall circulate a draft report to the members of the Promotion Committee to assure that it reflects the majority view of the faculty.

(4) The Department Chair will inform the candidates of the outcome by written notice, delivered not more than five working days after the meeting of the Promotion Committee.

(5) In any further actions concerning the recommendation for promotion, the Chair will be expected to report the outcome of the Promotion Committee vote.

(6) Although the vote of the faculty will not be binding upon the Chair, the vote of the faculty, the recommendation of the chair and supporting documents will be sent to the Dean in a letter, according to policies and procedures outlined by the university. A copy of the letter will be provided to the faculty member by the EDCI Department Chair and will be placed in the EDCI personnel file of the faculty member.

5. Review for Merit

Finally, the department has the primary responsibility for making all recommendations of salary changes (merit) for faculty (Section B-I. D. 1 of the Academic Charter). Although the Academic Charter does not require that this be done annually, EDCI requires such reviews on an annual basis to provide feedback on performance to the faculty member regardless of whether or not a merit salary allocation is made in a particular year. For specific information regarding meritorious performance, see EDCI Theory into Practice Merit Document.

a) Process for Merit

(1) Preparation Arrangements

(a) Candidates for Merit will submit materials to the EDCI Department Chair on or before Friday of the second week of February.
(b) Documents from the previous calendar year (January 1 through December 31) are prepared by individual faculty members.

(c) The documentation will be made available (in the office of the Chair) to the EDCI Merit Committee (which is composed of the members of the Department Advisory Council) for two weeks prior to the vote (see sections III, IV, and V for details regarding evidence).

(d) The following materials should be presented:

   (i) A resume in university format from January 1 through December 31 of the previous year.
   (ii) The merit worksheet fully completed.
   (iii) Evidence from the areas of teaching, research/creative work, service, and other appropriate evidence of productivity (see sections III, IV, V regarding evidence).

(e) A meeting of the Merit Committee will be called by the EDCI Chair. Written notice of the meeting shall be delivered to all council members at least two weeks before the meeting date.

b) Meeting Conduct

(1) The EDCI Chair will call and chair the meeting(s) of the Merit Committee for the purpose of voting.

(2) During discussion concerning each candidate for merit, the candidate has the option of being present to explain the documents and/or present additional information.

(3) The Merit Committee will have the opportunity to discuss the materials and information presented before the vote is taken.

c) Voting Procedures

(1) A separate ballot will be prepared for each candidate, by name, and distributed to all Merit Committee members.

(2) Merit Committee members who are unable to attend the meeting may return their ballots to a sealed container in the departmental office and will initial a departmental form indicating that they have voted or complete an absentee ballot.
(3) Ballots will be placed in the ballot container and taken into custody by the EDCI chair.

(4) Two Merit Committee members will be appointed by the EDCI chair to count the ballots and report the results within two working days.

(5) In the event of a failure to achieve the necessary majority, the EDCI chair will call a meeting of the Merit Committee for the purpose of soliciting a group statement of the reasons for voting “no.”

**d) Decision Making**

(1) The outcome necessary for a recommendation of merit is a two-thirds majority “yes” vote of all the “A & P Council” members. Failure to return a ballot will be counted as a vote of “no.”

(2) After the tabulation of all ballots, the EDCI chair will report the results in writing to all candidates for delivered not more than four working days after the meeting of the Merit Committee.

(5) In any further actions concerning the recommendation for promotion, the Chair will be expected to report the outcome of the Merit Committee vote.

(6) Although the vote of the faculty will not be binding upon the Chair, the vote of the faculty, the recommendation of the chair and supporting documents will be sent to the Dean according to policies and procedures outlined by the College.

**II. Allocation of Effort**

Each faculty member needs to allocate time and effort to a wide range of teaching, research/creative, and service obligations that promote the mission and goals of the University, college, and department. All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how departmental expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.
A. Departmental Norms

The department expects its faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort that approximates 50% teaching, 30% research/creative work, and 20% service. These weights will apply to most faculty who are carrying full teaching loads as defined by department policy. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives released time from teaching duties for administrative responsibilities, research, service, differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads or leaves granted by the Academic Charter or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment and, at any rate, no later than the beginning of the academic year. Probationary faculty will be evaluated for tenure based upon the department’s standard allocation of effort.

B. Individual Variations

The department’s standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty in the department unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be in accord with the department’s differential faculty workload policies, or reduced workloads, or leaves granted by the Academic Charter made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the department chair, and endorsed in writing by the dean of the college. Faculty on leave shall have the right to determine with the department chair the appropriate variation in the standard departmental allocation of effort in accordance with the purpose of the leave.

Although all percentage allocations are approximations and not exact time measurements, reasonable attempts must be made to insure that a faculty member’s allocation of effort is consistent with his/her actual distribution of workload for instruction, research/creative work, and service responsibilities. Unless otherwise specified in writing, a faculty member’s allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the period of any given academic year or contract period.

III. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the EDCI’s evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit. 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, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching

---

2 Consistent with the University Vision Statement of becoming the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation, the following suggested principle shall guide allocation policy for the department as a whole: [a] allocations for teaching and research should each exceed the allocation for service; [b] except for doctoral granting departments, the allocation for teaching should equal or exceed that for research; [c] doctoral-granting departments should place greater weight on research [perhaps 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service] than non-doctoral departments [where the allocation might be 50% teaching, 30% research, 20% service]. Allocations established by departments are subject to review by the dean of the college and by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
portfolio that contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. EDCI may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied (see Appendix A).

A. Undergraduate Teaching

Given the department’s involvement in undergraduate degree programs, it considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a principal component of a faculty member’s record of teaching. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching include: statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy; self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness; results of student evaluations of courses taught; peer teaching observations and evaluations; documentation of student learning outcomes (such as results of standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, and graduate follow-up studies); student enrollment and retention data; teaching awards and distinctions; and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching. EDCI requires that faculty provide evidence of effective teaching by way of a teaching portfolio which includes student evaluations.

B. Graduate Teaching

Given the department’s involvement in graduate degree programs at the masters/specialist/doctoral level(s), it expects that all faculty also will contribute to the learning of graduate students. Based upon one’s area of research/creative expertise and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, faculty should provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars and make appropriate contributions to the recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students. In addition, faculty with appropriate areas of expertise are expected to participate in the direction of theses and/or dissertations and to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty. In addition to the indicators of teaching effectiveness identified above that are applicable to graduate instruction, faculty members should maintain, as part of their teaching portfolio, at least the following performance indicators: dates of admission and graduation of directed students; placement (and other success indicators) of directed students; and record of extramural support secured for graduate students. EDCI requires that faculty provide evidence of effective teaching by way of a teaching portfolio (see Appendix A).

C. Instructional Development

Departmental faculty are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators required by EDCI include: course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; and the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses, conferences and workshops attended. Additional performance indicators which may be included are: courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and innovations in the effective use of
instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning (see Appendix A).

D. Contributions to Student Learning

Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance required by EDCI include: academic advising services provided to students; guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or cooperative work experiences. Optional performance indicators include: involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction; participation in University initiatives to create a campus wide learning community; involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students; participation in University, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching (see Appendix A).

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of teaching is this: Is the faculty member’s demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit as described in the University’s governance documents and supportive of the instructional mission of the department, college, and University?

IV. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one’s discipline is a central responsibility of all faculty members. Such contributions are important both 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 Department’s evaluation of faculty members who are under review for reappointment, tenure, promotion or merit. Domains used in the evaluation of research/creative work include: publications/presentations/performances; sponsored program extramural support; institutional outreach; reputation within the discipline. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research/creative work which addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation (see Appendix A).

A. Publications/Presentations/Performances

Publications, presentations, and performances are major products of any research/creative work and thus central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings are very significant. So, too, are the publication of books, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Research/creative work should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline. (Research and publication on pedagogy is the norm for some faculty, especially those whose discipline focuses on pedagogy.)
Faculty in EDCI should indicate the acceptance rate for articles published or submitted, the agency responsible for the publication, and the intended audience of the publication (see Appendix A).

B. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research or Creative Work

In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support is an important external validation of the quality of research and creative activity. While no specific quantity of extramural research support is required for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit, department expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. Performance indicators include: number of grant applications submitted; agency reviewers’ evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects (see Appendix A).

C. Institutional Outreach

Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships and in applied research and private consulting may be a significant component of a faculty member’s research/creative work. Performance indicators include: significance and scope of the activity; role of the faculty member in the activity; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments (see Appendix A).

D. Reputation within the Discipline

One indicator of the quality of a faculty member’s research/creative work is his/her reputation within the discipline. In the case of tenure and promotion, this quality may be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the department from authoritative reviewers external to the University. The reviewers will include individuals from a list provided by the candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the departmental review committee. At least one reviewer must be selected from each list, with three to six letters included in the file. Overemphasis on external review may lead to a distortion of the standard departmental allocation of effort since external reviewers cannot effectively evaluate service and teaching contributions at BGSU.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in research/creative work that is appropriate to his/her specific case (see Appendix A). The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of research/creative work is this: Is the faculty member’s performance in research/creative work consistent with the general standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit as described in University governance documents and specified by the department?

---

3 External peer reviews are not required for annual review, for merit and for contract renewal.
V. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness

Service contributions by faculty at the department, college, and University, professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession. For faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, a record which documents continuous and active involvement in service is required. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record which documents significant service to the University or profession is required (see Appendix A).

The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; contributions to a faculty member’s profession. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation.

A. Internal University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators used to evaluate internal service may include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators used to evaluate administrative service may include: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others (see Appendix A).

B. External Community Service

Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs. To be considered as community service appropriate for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member’s expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or University as qualifying. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used to evaluate community service may include: records of relevant activities and professional contributions;
degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognitions; written statements or testimonials (see Appendix A).

C. Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member’s membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service may include: records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or extramural funding agencies; attendance at professional meetings and conferences; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; professional recognitions; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; conference papers presented; or sessions moderated that contribute to the profession.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case (see Appendix A). The question to be considered by the department in evaluating service is this: Is the faculty member’s performance in service consistent with the general standards for reappointment, tenure, promotion or merit as described in University governance documents and as specified by the department?

Approved by the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
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The Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction is committed to promoting faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service by acknowledging that exemplary performance occurs in a diversity of ways and in different communities. The EDCI faculty has identified eight areas of professional activity and have classified these areas under the headings of Teaching, Research and Service. The intent of having these eight areas is to recognize that individual EDCI faculty members may achieve high levels of performance in distinctly different ways. Therefore, it is unlikely that any faculty member will achieve the highest level of performance in all eight areas at a given period in his/her professional development.

The eight areas of professional activity are:
- Professional Growth
- Teaching Effectiveness
- Academic Guidance
- Curricular Innovation
- Technology Integration
- Scholarly Inquiry and Dissemination
- Community Action
- Integrating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

Due to the diverse nature of several of the areas of professional activity, it is possible to incorporate an area of professional activity under more than one of the three categories of Teaching, Research and Service.

Category: Teaching
- Professional Growth
- Teaching Effectiveness
- Curricular Innovation
- Technology Integration
- Integrating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

Category: Research
- Scholarly Inquiry and Dissemination
- Professional Growth
- Integrating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

Category: Service
- Professional Growth
- Curricular Innovation
- Academic Guidance
- Community Action
- Integrating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

Each of the eight areas of professional activity has been divided into levels of performance. In order for a faculty member to receive tenure and promotion, it is
essential that his/her overall performance in the three categories of Teaching, Research and Service reflect Levels 2 & 3.

The four levels of performance are:

Level 3: This level constitutes outstanding performance and significant leadership in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as an EDCI faculty member.

Level 2: This level constitutes performance and significant contribution that goes beyond the expected allocation of effort required to fulfill the contractual responsibilities of an EDCI faculty member.

Level 1: This level constitutes participation and performance of the expected behaviors for completion of the contractual responsibilities of an EDCI faculty member.

Level 0: This level constitutes insufficient participation and performance of the expected behaviors for completion of the contractual responsibilities of an EDCI faculty member.

Example behaviors for each of the eight areas of professional activity and performance criteria for the three levels are provided.

Required Areas: A faculty member must achieve at least Level 2 performance in the following three required areas to be considered for tenure and promotion:

- Teaching Effectiveness
- Scholarly Inquiry and Dissemination
- Community Action and/or Initiating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

Professional Activity Area: Professional Growth

General Description: The behaviors in which a faculty member engages to progress as an educator are defined as Professional Growth. These behaviors enhance effectiveness in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Each faculty member will develop and implement a Professional Development Plan which outlines these behaviors in accordance with departmental procedures. Performance Indicators include:

- Completion of Relevant Course(s)
- Completion of Relevant Workshop(s)
- Attendance at Professional Conference(s)
- Self Directed Study
- Professional Membership(s)
- Extramural Funding Activities
- Peer Collaboration: Intradisciplinary or Interdisciplinary
Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level fulfills his/her Professional Development Plan and provides evidence of application in at least one area of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level documents significant progress in fulfilling the behaviors outlined in his/her Professional Development Plan.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member develops an annual Professional Development Plan in accordance with departmental procedures.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member does not develop an annual Professional Development Plan in accordance with departmental procedures.

Professional Area of Activity: Teaching Effectiveness

General Description: Excellent teaching can be measured by student learning and effective teachers create opportunities for students to meet nationally defined standards of achievement. Each faculty member will develop a teaching portfolio documenting effectiveness in this area. The portfolio will contain labels that indicate the items enclosed and the rationale for item selection. Documentation should not exceed 10 pages. Performance indicators that may be provided in the portfolio include:

- Self Reflective Cover Letter Justifying the Portfolio Contents
- Student Course Evaluations - Fall, Spring Required
- Course Syllabi
- Awards and Recognition Related to Teaching
- Evidence of Project/Thesis/Dissertation Service
- Examples of Teaching Innovations
- Samples of Student Work
- Peer Evaluations
- Unsolicited Letters of Support

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: The faculty member provides students with diverse and effective opportunities to learn as defined by standards of teaching excellence. These opportunities will be documented in the teaching portfolio. The faculty member will demonstrate consistent excellence in teaching by submitting at least three examples of evidence in addition to the student course evaluations and course syllabi. The ratings on the departmental course evaluation form will meet departmental guidelines.

Level 2: The faculty member demonstrates a clear alignment of course goals, instructional strategies, and assessment techniques. The faculty member demonstrates consistent effective teaching by submitting at least two examples of evidence in
addition to the student course evaluations. The ratings on the departmental course evaluation form will meet departmental guidelines.

Level 1: The faculty member demonstrates organization and preparation in instruction. The faculty member demonstrates effective teaching by submitting at least one example of evidence in addition to the student course evaluations.

Level 0: The faculty member does not demonstrate organization and preparation in instruction. The faculty member does not demonstrate effective teaching by submitting at least one example of evidence in addition to the student course evaluations.

Focus: BGSU
Professional Activity Area: Academic Guidance

General Description: Academic Guidance refers to the behaviors that a faculty member engages in to assist others - students and faculty - in fulfilling their professional potential.

Performance Indicators include:
• Individual and/or Group Advising
• Peer and/or Student Mentoring
• Student Organizations

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides significant leadership in the area of academic guidance. The faculty member may demonstrate an innovative approach to advising or effectively advise a significantly larger number of advisees than the average number of advisees assigned within the department. The faculty member may serve as an effective mentor to students and/or new faculty and engage in other behaviors that foster the professional development of students and/or faculty.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides a significant contribution to the academic guidance of assigned advisees through individual and/or group advising and may assume mentoring responsibilities for individual students and/or faculty and/or engage in other professional development activities.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member at this level holds regular weekly office hours and provides a schedule of these hours to the departmental secretary. The faculty member meets with assigned advisees and provides appropriate academic guidance in a timely fashion.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member at this level does not hold regular weekly office hours and/or provide a schedule of these hours to the departmental secretary. The faculty member does not meet with assigned advisees and/or provide appropriate academic guidance in a timely fashion.
Professional Activity Area: Curricular Innovation

General Description: Curricular Innovation refers to the behaviors in which a faculty member engages to enhance approaches, design and/or delivery of instruction within existing and/or emerging academic programs.

- Performance Indicators include:
  - Course Development/Redesign
  - Program Development/Redesign
  - Program Innovations Interdisciplinary Collaborations
  - Extramural Funding Activities
  - Program Area Activities
  - National/State Curriculum Involvement

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level demonstrates significant leadership in developing and promoting curricular innovations within existing academic programs and/or emerging programs deemed important to the overall mission of the department, college and/or university.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides a significant contribution to improving existing academic programs and/or developing new programs deemed important to the overall academic mission of the department, college and/or university.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member at this level participates in program redesign and evaluation in accordance with college and departmental guidelines. Professional Activity Area: Technology Integration

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member does not participate in program redesign and evaluation in accordance with college and departmental guidelines.

General Description: In order for students and teachers to feel comfortable with and competent in the use of technology, they must have exposure to and practice with technology throughout their education. For this to happen, a faculty member should model the use of technology and integrate its use in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities.

Performance Indicators include:
- Modeling the Use of Technology
- Technology Integration into the Curriculum
- Creation of Media Formats for Teaching and/or Presentation Purposes
- Extramural Funding
- Distance Learning
Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level demonstrates exceptional leadership, contributions, or improvements in technology use related to teaching, scholarship and/or service.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level demonstrates significant contributions or improvements in the use of technology related teaching, scholarship and/or service.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member participates in technology training as needed. The faculty member uses technology for personal productivity such as for preparing syllabi, handouts, transparencies as appropriate. The faculty member encourages or requires students to use technology for assignments when appropriate.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member does not appropriately utilize technology for personal productivity and/or encourage students to use technology.

Professional Activity Area: Scholarly Inquiry and Dissemination

General Description: Scholarly Inquiry and Dissemination refers to the research in which a faculty member engages to add to the existing knowledge in an academic discipline and to share this contribution with others who would benefit from such knowledge.

Performance Indicators include:
- Manuscript Reviews
- Publications - Articles, Books, Book Chapters, Reviews, Editorship
- Presentations - Refereed and/or Invited
- Consultations - Paid and/or Unpaid
- Workshops
- Extramural Funding Activities

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides significant leadership in the pursuit and dissemination of academic knowledge. The faculty member will demonstrate a consistent record of research resulting in publications, presentations, consultations, extramural funding and other related activities.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides a significant contribution to the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. These behaviors may include publications, extramural funding activities, national and state presentations at learned society meetings and/or other related activities.
Level 1: An EDCI faculty member at this level develops a research agenda as part of his/her Professional Development Plan. The faculty member engages in behaviors that demonstrate appropriate dissemination of his/her scholarly activities.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member at this level does not develop a research agenda as part of his/her Professional Development Plan. The faculty member does not engage in behaviors that demonstrate appropriate dissemination of his/her scholarly activities.

Performance Activity Area: Community Action

General Description: Community Action is the application of knowledge and theory in diverse settings and through activities that impact society. These activities may initiate at the university and/or society level but they must be clearly identified with Bowling Green State University.

Performance Indicators include:
• Public Relations Activities i.e. Developing Program Area Brochure
• University/Campus Events i.e. Preview Day, Graduation, Homecoming
• Outreach Efforts i.e. Recruitment, Service Learning
• Extramural Funding Activities
• Committee Participation - University/College/Department
• Program Area Events i.e. Principal Breakfast, Methods Registration

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member demonstrates significant leadership in activities that clearly impact on the university and/or greater community. Evidence of both the leadership rendered and the broad impact of these activities should be provided.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member contributes significantly to activities that clearly affect the university and/or greater community. Documentation of contributions that go beyond expected levels of participation should be provided.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member participates in a minimum of two university/campus events each academic year. The faculty member participates in the operation of the department by attending regularly scheduled department meetings and serving on a minimum of two EDCI committees.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member does not participate in a minimum of two university/campus events each academic year. The faculty member does not participate in the operation of the department by attending regularly scheduled department meetings and serving on a minimum of two EDCI committees.
Professional Activity Area: Integrating and Sustaining University/School/Community Partnerships

General Description: Linkages between the university and the larger community are vital to university and the community involved whether it is a school, school system or society. Integrating and sustaining university/school/community partnerships refers to activities that support these linkages. Therefore, a faculty member would engage in behaviors designed to establish and enhance these connections beyond the university.

Performance Indicators include:
• Professional Development School
• Field Experience Activities
• Extramural Funding Activities
• School/Community Projects

Levels of Performance:

Level 3: An EDCI faculty member at this level provides significant leadership to the creation and/or operation of a university/school/community partnership. Behaviors may include exploring partnership opportunities through outreach activities, developing and coordinating partnership activities and obtaining extramural funding to enhance partnerships.

Level 2: An EDCI faculty member at this level contributes significantly to the creation and operation of a university/school/community partnership. Behaviors may include visiting interested sites, participating in the coordination of partnership activities and seeking extramural funding to enhance partnerships.

Level 1: An EDCI faculty member at this level participates in university/school/community partnership activities when part of his/her assigned professional responsibilities.

Level 0: An EDCI faculty member at this level does not participate in university/school/community partnership activities when part of his/her assigned professional responsibilities.
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