College of Design’s Guide to: Term Faculty Renewals and Advancements

This document is to guide College of Design Faculty Members and Review Committees through the University’s Term Faculty Renewal and Advancement Processes

Updated: 2020
The purpose of this document is to assist term faculty preparing for their advancement review. The materials contained in this document have been collected from the following sources:

- Evaluation, Renewal and Advancement of Term Faculty Appointments on the Senior Vice President and Provost’s website
- Iowa State University Faculty Handbook
- College of Design Governance Document

All review and evaluation procedures will follow accepted university guidelines as specified in the Faculty Handbook, College of Design Governance Document, and applicable departmental governance documents. In the absence of specific guidelines or in case of a conflict, university and/or college policies will take precedence.

Faculty are advised to read sections pertaining to term faculty reviews in the Faculty Handbook, the College of Design Governance Document, and in their department’s governance document.

This document is a work in progress. If you have concerns, edits, etc., please contact the Senior Associate Dean.
Purpose of a Term Faculty Reviews
For the purposes of evaluating performance, Iowa State University uses the following forms of review for term faculty:

- Annual reviews (chair or designee)
- Review for renewal of appointment. (Peer review)
- Review for advancement

Annual performance review
Term faculty (full-time and part-time) shall receive an annual performance review by the chair (or designee). The review shall follow FH 5.1.1.2 and department guidelines. It is best practice for the department chair and faculty member to discuss advancement during every annual evaluation to discuss progress and intent.

Review for renewal
Term faculty appointments are eligible for renewal based upon the quality of performance and the continuing need of the unit. Term faculty members, full-time and part-time, shall be reviewed by an appropriate faculty committee (peers) before the end of their third year after the initial appointment date. Peer reviews shall take place every three years (not counting annual reviews) OR at appointment renewal time, whichever is greater.

Advancement review
All term faculty may be proposed for advancement to the next rank according to the schedule and current time at rank as specified in FH Section 3.3.2.3.

Process for a Term Renewal Review

Timeline
It is the department chair’s responsibility to work with their term faculty members to discuss their intent to be renewed or direct the mandatory review per years of service. After it is determined a renewal is appropriate, it is then the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare the renewal review documents.

The term faculty member seeking renewal is responsible to submit their renewal packet to their departmental partner for their respective area by January 20th. The departmental partner will then work with the respective department chair to begin the departmental review. A complete calendar of events is listed at – Additional Resources, Deadline Calendar –Renewal.

Review Materials
The faculty member is responsible for providing the following information for the review process, unless otherwise stipulated by the respective departmental governance document.

1. Section 1*, reviewed for accuracy by the department chair
   a. All Position Responsibility Statements (PRS) since initial appointment or last review
   b. A current vita organized according to the college’s Promotion and Tenure Vita Guidelines

Review materials will be submitted electronically via a CyBox folder that is set up by and maintained by the departmental partner.

*Section 1 will be available to the candidate throughout the review.
Department Review Committee and Evaluation Letter
The departmental review committee, composed of term faculty of equal or greater rank, will participate in the review process and are responsible for reviewing the faculty member’s renewal review materials and preparing an evaluation letter addressed to the department chair. The letter should not be a review of the process, recitation of the CV, or a summary statement. The evaluation should point out, discuss, and analyze strengths and weaknesses in the case. It is a best practice to put concerns up front and deal with them directly and clearly. The outcomes of these reviews shall inform appointment renewal decisions.

The evaluation letter should include the names and ranks of the faculty members who reviewed the case. This letter is considered confidential and is not shared with the faculty member seeking renewal.

Department Chair’s Review and Contract Renewal
The department chair is responsible for reviewing the faculty member’s renewal review materials and the department review committee’s evaluation. Following the department chair’s independent review, the department chair is responsible for determining if the employment contract will be renewed and the renewal terms. The department chair will then work with the HR Coordinator to route the renewal documents.

Process for an Advancement Review

Timeline
It is the department chair’s responsibility to work with their term faculty members to discuss their intent to be advanced. After it is determined an advancement is appropriate and the term faculty member has met the college’s minimum criteria, it is then the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare the advancement documents. It is best practice for the department chair and faculty member to discuss advancement during every annual evaluation to discuss progress and intent.

The term faculty member seeking advancement is responsible to submit their Advancement Review packet to their departmental partner for their respective area by December 1st. The departmental partner will then work with the respective department chair to begin the departmental review. A complete calendar of events is listed at – Additional Resources, Deadline Calendar - Advancement.

Review Materials
The faculty member seeking advancement is responsible for providing the following information for the review process. Please refer to the respective departmental governance document, for additional submittal requirements. Advancement dossier should align with the faculty member’s PRS and should demonstrate the quality and effectiveness of their work.

- Cover Sheet, reviewed for accuracy by the department chair, found on the Senior Vice President and Provost Office Website
- Section 1*, reviewed for accuracy by the department chair
  - All Position Responsibility Statements (PRS) since initial appointment or last advancement
  - A current vita organized according to the College’s Promotion and Tenure Vita Guidelines
Section 2*
A summary of candidate accomplishments, not to exceed 10 pages. The summary should follow the college’s narrative guidelines and provide detail and context regarding the candidate’s accomplishments during the review period. Suggested formatting of this section can be found within the Additional Resources Section - Section 2 Formatting.

Section 3*
Optional supplementary portfolio of selected works in support of Section 2. The portfolio, if included, is not intended to be an exhaustive compendium of work but rather a brief synopsis of accomplishments in support of materials presented in Section 2. Portfolio and supplemental materials are used during the departmental and collegiate review but are not forwarded to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Review materials will be submitted electronically via a CyBox folder that is set up by and maintained by the departmental partner.

External letters are not required as part of this review, unless the term faculty member is a member of the Research track.

*Sections 1, 2 and 3 will be available to the candidate throughout the review.

Department Review Committee and Evaluation Letter
The departmental review committee is responsible for reviewing the faculty member’s advancement review materials and preparing an evaluation letter addressed to the department chair. The letter should not be a review of the process, recitation of the CV, or a summary statement. The evaluation should point out, discuss, and analyze strengths and weaknesses in the case. It is a best practice to put concerns up front and deal with them directly and clearly.

The evaluation letter should include the names and ranks of the faculty members who reviewed the case. This letter is considered confidential and is not shared with the faculty member seeking advancement.

Department Chair’s Review and Evaluation Letter
The department chair is responsible for reviewing the faculty member’s advancement review materials and the department review committee’s evaluation. Following this review, the department chair is responsible for writing an evaluation letter addressed to the dean that provides clear and constructive feedback about the faculty member seeking advancement’s accomplishments and if the advancement is supported.

This letter is considered confidential and is not shared with the faculty member seeking advancement.

Notification
The chair will inform the candidate in writing before the department's recommendations are submitted to the college.
Dean’s Review and Evaluation Letter

The dean is responsible for conducting an independent, analytical review and writing an evaluation letter addressed to the Senior Vice President and Provost (or appointing a review committee on his or her behalf). The evaluation letter must detail the candidate’s performance and impact identifying and analyzing strengths and weaknesses and addressing concerns directly and clearly. The primary purpose of the letter is to assess whether the candidate meets the qualification for advancement based on the criteria in university, college, and departmental governance documents as well as disciplinary expectations.

Notification

The dean will inform in writing each candidate the college’s recommendation before the advancement request is submitted to the Senior Vice President and Provost. Faculty who are not being recommended for advancement will receive constructive feedback and, where appropriate, should include guidance for improving performance in terms of the college’s criteria for advancement. Faculty who are supported for advancement will be forwarded to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Additional Resources

Deadline Calendar – Renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 20th</td>
<td>Term Faculty member submits Renewal Review Packet to Departmental Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1st</td>
<td>Departmental Review begins, and write a letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15th</td>
<td>Department Chair reviews peer reviewed documents and submits contract renewal documents to HR Coordinator, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15th</td>
<td>Deadline for renewal contract to be electronically signed by all parties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** If due date fall on a weekend or holiday, the information is due the Friday prior to the due date.

Deadline Calendar – Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1st</td>
<td>Term Faculty member submits Advancement Review Packet to Departmental Partner and departmental review begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15th</td>
<td>Departmental letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair, submitted to Departmental Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1st</td>
<td>Department Chair review begins, and writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15th</td>
<td>Dean begins review for informational purposes, and writes a summary memo of the review process and final outcomes to the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1st</td>
<td>Final decision is forwarded to the Provost Office, for informational purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** If due date(s) fall on a weekend or holiday, the information is due the Friday prior to the due date.
Section 2 Formatting

2.1 Candidate’s Statement
An integrative statement including the candidate’s teaching philosophy and contributions to the teaching mission of relevant departments and programs.

2.2 Teaching Summary

A. Courses taught and student evaluation of teaching effectiveness

A table including all courses taught during this review period with student ratings of teaching effectiveness will be prepared by college staff using the format shown below and provided as a PDF for inclusion in the advancement dossier. This table is included in the 10-page count. Use this section to discuss any courses where instructor/course ratings are lower than departmental averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term – most recent first</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number who Responded</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>Instructor Overall Rating*</th>
<th>Dept. Average*</th>
<th>College Average*</th>
<th>Course Overall Rating*</th>
<th>Dept. Average*</th>
<th>College Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Other Evaluations of Teaching (if applicable)

Summarize outcomes of peer evaluation of teaching, classroom observations, review of teaching materials, etc.

C. Course and Curriculum Development (if applicable)

Summarize contributions to course and curriculum development, the development of new teaching materials, the use of creative teaching techniques, and contributions to professional societies concerned with pedagogy.

D. Professional Development Related to Teaching (if applicable)

List and describe professional development related to teaching completed during this review period.

E. Advising Responsibilities (if included in PRS)

F. Honors and Awards Related to Teaching (and Advising if included in PRS)

2.3 Contributions and Recognitions Related to Other Responsibilities Included in the PRS (if applicable)

2.4 Additional Contributions (optional)

Although not required, a candidate may include contributions made to the department, college, and/or university that go beyond responsibilities listed in their PRS.