

## **Review Preparation Guidelines for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

This document seeks to explain the nature of the review process at Augustana and to offer suggestions that may result in more standardized presentations and more effective narratives by reviewees and their Dept./Program Chairs.

Even though the Faculty Handbook stipulates that all *tenure-track* faculty must undergo annual reviews with their Department Chairs, this action often has been neglected; in recent years FWC has strongly encouraged the completion of these reviews, as a means to give junior faculty more timely feedback (and to aid Chairs in their documentation of a candidate's progress). At the present time, the Faculty Handbook does not stipulate that non-tenure-track faculty must undergo annual reviews, but Department Chairs are encouraged to conduct them. FWC offers the brief "worksheet/action plan" as an example of an annual review document that could be useful in promoting reflection and assessment: <https://www.augustana.edu/about-us/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-welfare/review-preparation> The completion of these annual departmental worksheets makes preparation for the 5-year FWC reviews less onerous for both the faculty member and the Department Chair.

### **An overview of the FWC review process – why undergo a FWC review?**

These reviews have two goals: 1. to help the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) better understand the achievements as well as the special circumstances and challenges faced by non-tenure-track faculty, and 2. to help these non-tenure-track faculty to become more effective members of our community. The review process for non-tenure-track faculty is described in Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook. Not all non-tenure-track faculty members are required to undergo regular review by FWC, however, those who want to gain the privilege of the right to vote on divisional and full faculty matters must do so.

A FWC review should occur every five years, starting from the initial time of hire. After a successful first review and the appropriate number of accumulated credits, as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook, the faculty member is automatically granted voting rights.

The FWC review process will vary slightly, depending on whether the faculty member is seeking promotion. Regular -- non-promotion -- reviews occur with a 3-person subpanel of the FWC. Promotion reviews occur with the full 7-person

FWC (which includes the Dean of the College); see sections 4.3 and 4.5 of the Faculty Handbook for information regarding promotion eligibility.

### **When to submit: time-line for submission of materials and reviews**

Performance reviews are generally scheduled for the spring semester, although in certain cases they occur in the fall. Regardless of the semester, the deadline for this official submission is Monday of week 3 of the semester. However, note that, in order to submit your final version by the deadline date, you should probably begin the process by or even before the beginning of that semester (meet with your Dept. Chair and give them your portfolio well in advance of the deadline). The Academic Affairs Office will schedule reviews so that they begin one week after the respective materials submission due date, and you will be informed of that date well in advance of the hearing. Reviews will occur either in-person on campus (ideally) or on-line via a Google Meet conference call if social distancing rules require it.

### **Your FWC Review Materials: what to submit**

You must include: (1) a current curriculum vitae (CV), (2) a ~5- to 7-page personal statement, (3) electronic versions of all of your complete Student Ratings of Instruction IDEA forms, in addition to (4) any supporting materials that you would like FWC to see. Your Department Chair will submit their own letter of support directly to FWC.

The personal statement (2) should cover three areas: (2.1) responsibilities, (2.2) achievements and (2.3) goals. It should detail your own past and probable future growth and maturation as a teacher and advisor, an academic professional, and a contributor of service as an Augustana faculty member, with claims supported by evidence.

The (2.1) "responsibilities" section should explain your job, especially if you engage in non-standard faculty activities, and the constructive role you play as a member of your home department. You should list what courses or lessons are taught and what non-course activities are handled.

The (2.2) "achievements" section is the main part of your narrative. Part teaching philosophy, part introspection, part progress report, it should include thoughtful reflection of how you have addressed your successes and setbacks and how you have grown as a teacher and professional. Don't be humble; this is your opportunity to honestly describe your awesome achievements. Ideally, your discussion of achievements should not just discuss your strengths; you should frankly and concretely discuss areas of challenge or difficulty in your work. If FWC has suggested areas for improvement at a prior review, then you should address those issues specifically.

In evaluating a typical faculty portfolio, FWC considers three performance criteria, and, thus, these usually should be addressed directly in your achievements section (2.2) of your narrative:

The first of these criteria is (2.2.1) *teaching effectiveness*, which also includes any student advising and mentoring that you may have done. FWC asks for the opinions of colleagues (generally your Dept. Chair) who observe your teaching, and looks at the clarity and specificity of course and advising syllabi (if you advise students), and the variety and difficulty of the courses taught. If relevant, your narrative should include a reflective discussion of the results of student evaluations of your teaching (Student Ratings of Instruction, SRIs; currently the IDEA form). Student evaluation data (both quantitative and written responses) are just one source of evidence of your teaching effectiveness, but they are important to consider. You should consider quantitative score results as a point for reflective conversation: how do you make sense of the results when read against your teaching objectives and strategies? Where are your areas of strength? Areas of challenge? Include analysis of IDEA score trends, ideally with summarizing tables and/or graphs (and n=# of student respondents). Have you selected appropriate learning objectives as identified on the IDEA instrument? Do your pedagogical choices align with these objectives? More information on how to interpret and respond to IDEA evaluation results can be requested from the Institutional Research office.

Evidence of student learning is the most important element of a case for teaching effectiveness but is often the hardest component to assess. You could write about how you have monitored your classroom work (through course evaluations, classroom or group instructional visits by colleagues, and so on), how you have critiqued student work, and what you have learned through those assessments, and what steps you have taken to make your teaching and

mentoring stronger. You might also describe your input into notable student achievements (e.g., papers accepted at honors conferences or acceptances into graduate programs).

The second criterion is (2.2.2) *professional activity*, an umbrella term used to signify all of those activities which reveal professional expression or development. Evidence of professional expression might include submission or acceptance of publications, professional presentations, public presentations of artistic creations and performances, the application for or receipt of research grants, and conference or other presentations. Evidence of professional development might include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, completion of professional certification, and continuing education in relevant areas. Depending on your particular situation and job description, this section may be a significant, minimal or even non-existent part of your narrative.

The final criterion is (2.2.3) *service to the College and to the community*. The College has always held that the responsibilities of its professionals extend beyond the limits of their classrooms and disciplinary interests, which means that FWC looks for evidence that your presence has enriched the communities in which you live and work. On-campus service includes departmental and campus-wide committee work, while pertinent off-campus activities could include service to professional organizations, journals or conferences, as officers, editors and reviewers, and organizers and session chairs, respectively. The distinctions between professional activity and professional service versus professional activity and scholarly activity are somewhat vague; FWC leaves it up to faculty members to decide what best suits their own needs and sensibilities and articulate those views in their case-making statements accordingly. Depending on your particular situation and job description, this section may be a significant, minimal or even non-existent part of your narrative.

The (2.3) "goals" section should briefly summarize your goals for the next five years, identifying your priorities for continued development and improvement in (2.3.1) teaching, (2.3.2) professional activity and (2.3.3) service.

Submit only electronic (not hard copy) versions of (3) all of your complete IDEA forms with student comments, organized by course, then chronologically (your own summarizing tables, graphs and analysis of these data should be part of your case-making statement, 2.2.1).

You may include (4) additional material if you desire; it is especially appropriate to do so if you are being considered for promotion. Regardless of whether they

are electronic (**preferable**) or hard copies, include a contents list of these optional materials and tell us why you are including them – *why* are they important to your narrative. A few exemplars are always preferred to an overabundance of repetition.

- If you submit any hard copy supplemental materials, include a hard copy of your CV and case-making narrative as well.
- Evidence of student learning usually comes in the form of samples of student work that illustrate learning outcomes connected to the clearly articulated objectives you set for your courses. Samples of student work should display a range of student outcomes (e.g., not just "A" work, but at a variety of grade levels). They should also illustrate growth or improvement of student performance over time in response to your critiques (e.g., multiple paper drafts; pre- and post-test results). It is helpful to include a brief cover statement on such samples, to inform the reviewers how the samples address your learning objectives and what specific qualities to look for in the samples. Evidence of student learning can also come in the form of data you collect from students based on relevant instruments (e.g., pre- and post-testing, student knowledge surveys, etc.), if feasible and desirable. Though this critical component of your overall portfolio can be exhaustive in this supplemental materials section, a succinct analysis and summary of these data should be part of your case-making narrative.
- Syllabi (both for courses and for advising)
- Evidence of advising engagement and/or effectiveness, such as a description of your activities with advisees and student surveys.
- A representative sample of your professional work. This might include books or book chapters, articles, conference presentations, reviews, or reproductions of creative work (e.g., pictures, audio and/or video formats of creations or performances). In selecting material for inclusion, remember that the background and training of the members of the committee varies widely. Include items that have been published or submitted/accepted for publication.
- Reviews of your professional work or other evidence of its quality.
- Evidence of the quality and effort of your contributions in the area of departmental, campus, professional, and/or community service, beyond a mere list of service items. For example, brief descriptions of your concrete contributions or letters of support from colleagues (see below).

- Letters from former students who may be able to attest to your role in their personal and professional growth. These letters commonly are unsolicited and usually are sent from students directly to faculty members; you may include them in a folder within your supplemental materials folder.
- Letters of support from colleagues on campus, including those with whom you have served on committees and those who have observed your teaching. If they have been shared with you, you may include them in a folder within your supplemental materials folder -- otherwise ask your colleagues to send their confidential letters directly to the two email submission sites.
- Letters of support from colleagues at other institutions who may be able to attest to the role of your contribution to your discipline. In order to guarantee the greatest level of candor and credibility, you should *not* have the opportunity to read individual letters. Ask your writers to email their letters directly to the FWC Chair, and assure them that their letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.

### **How to submit your portfolio**

1. Upload the well-organized materials comprising your portfolio (items 1-4 above) into your Google Drive folder and share them with your Departmental Chair and *BOTH* [facultywelfare@augustana.edu](mailto:facultywelfare@augustana.edu) AND [facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu](mailto:facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu) (one site is for archiving and the other is for distribution to committee members). You must label the shared main folder with the following information, formatted as specified: "Performance Review portfolio for first name last name date" as mm.dd.yyyy (example: "Performance Review portfolio for Gustav Mauler 09.01.1860"). Files and subfolders within this main folder should be labeled & organized.
2. Complete and submit to the Academic Affairs Office a hard copy of the "Checklist for non-tenure faculty reviews" form, found at: <https://www.augustana.edu/about-us/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-welfare/review-preparation>
3. Submit hard copy sets of your core documents to the Academic Affairs Office: (1) CV and (2) case-making narrative. If you are having a normal (non-

promotion) review, submit three hard copy sets. If you are having a promotion review, submit seven hard copy sets.

### **The role of your Department Chair**

Your Department Chair should:

- Start observing your teaching during your first year, and help you to administer the required IDEA course evaluations, beginning with your first semester and including every appropriate course taught; “helping” includes discussions about the selection of relevant choices of IDEA form essential, important and minor learning objectives;
- Help you interpret the results of student evaluations and encourage you to graph those results to show trends over time and across courses;
- Help you to improve your teaching in response to justifiable student critiques;
- Provide you with opportunities to participate in the life of the department and College and remind you about the importance of factors beyond classroom teaching including collegiality and work-family life balance issues;
- Provide a thorough and honest end-of-year annual review of your progress (in non-FWC-review years), including a summary letter and conversation. These yearly letters should be shared with Academic Affairs.

### **The FWC review**

The review will consist of you, your Department Chair, and FWC members (3 or 7, depending on whether it’s a regular or promotion review). Performance reviews last approximately one hour. The first part of each hearing consists of an optional oral presentation by the candidate. These presentations typically take fewer than five minutes; you should avoid needless repetition of information already submitted in the written materials. You may wish to:

- Provide important updates on relevant points occurring after the submission of your materials.
- Draw attention to particular strengths of your case, particularly those factors whose significance might not be immediately grasped by someone from outside of your field.
- Respond to those factors which might reflect negatively upon your case.

- Discuss your role in the future of your discipline, department and College.

At the conclusion of your oral presentation the FWC members (and Dean, if it's a promotion review) will ask you questions for another 30 to 45 minutes, generally concerning your past experiences and future plans with the College, and more specifically asking for clarifications and elaborations of the details of your portfolio. At the conclusion of this discussion, you will leave the hearing. Your Department Chair will remain to discuss the merits of your case with the Faculty Welfare Committee, and to answer any questions they may have.

### **Letter & follow-up conversation (the “debrief”)**

The Faculty Welfare Committee will provide you with a letter that congratulates your successes and articulates areas of concern that should be addressed before your next review. This letter is written by your Division Chair, vetted and edited by the rest of FWC and signed by the FWC Chair; it becomes part of your permanent record.

A few weeks after your review, and following your receipt of this letter and consultation with your Department Chair, you will have a short (<15 min.) follow-up conversation with your Department Chair, Division Chair, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and Dean. The purpose of the conversation is to allow you the opportunity to respond to the contents of the letter – to ask for clarification or for changes to be made in the wording. This meeting will also try to alert you to any obstacles or challenges which may lie ahead and to inform you of the FWC's reaction to your presentation.

The performance review is an advisory process designed to help non-tenure-track faculty members gain some general assessment of their development relative to the parameters of the College's and department's expectations for its faculty. Regular reviews are formative, and promotion reviews are summative.

The intent of this performance review process is to provide constructive feedback through frank, honest and transparent communication and procedures to assist the non-tenure-track faculty member to grow as a productive member of our community. At any point during the process, please consult with your Department Chair, Division Chair, and/or the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee for help with any questions or concerns you may have.