

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.

An overview of the review process – why undergo a review?

These reviews have two goals: 1. to help the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) 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 FRC, however, those who want to gain the privilege of the right to vote on divisional and full faculty matters must do so.

A 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 granted voting rights.

The 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 FRC. Promotion reviews occur with the full FRC (which includes the Dean of the College); see sections 4.3 and 4.5 of the Faculty Handbook for information regarding promotion eligibility.

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-FRC-review years), including a summary letter and conversation. This yearly letter should be shared with Academic Affairs.

Your Review Materials

You must include a current curriculum vitae (CV), a ~5- to 7-page personal statement, and summaries of your IDEA forms (and links to complete IDEA forms), as well as any supporting (optional) materials that you would like the FRC to see. Your Department Chair will submit their own letter of support directly to FRC after sharing it with you.

The personal statement should cover three areas: responsibilities, goals and achievements, and the constructive role you play as a member of your home department. 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. This statement, part philosophy, part introspection, part progress report, is key and constitutes the core of your portfolio. You should address your successes and setbacks and how you have grown as a teacher, and you should reflect upon your approach to DEI issues (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion).

The "responsibilities" section should explain your job, especially if you engage in non-standard faculty activities. You should list what courses or lessons are taught and what non-course activities are handled.

The "goals" section should address what you have tried to achieve as a teacher and as a professional. This section includes your teaching philosophy, strategies and objectives and should also cover goals for the next five years. Following this section on your teaching, you should address these same considerations as they relate to your professional development and campus service.

The "achievements" section should explain how you have achieved your past goals pertaining to your teaching, professional development, and service. You could describe how you have monitored your classroom work (through course evaluations, classroom or group instructional visits by colleagues, and so on),

and what you have learned through that assessment, and what steps you have taken to make your teaching stronger. You might also talk about notable student achievements (e.g., papers accepted at honors conferences or acceptances into graduate programs) and recognition of your own work (e.g., awards, invitations to guest lecture or to teach summer institutes and workshops). 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. You should then briefly but concretely summarize your goals for the next five years, identifying your priorities for continuing development and improvement. If FRC has suggested areas for improvement at a prior review, then you should address those issues specifically.

If relevant, your narrative should include a reflective discussion of the results of student evaluations of your teaching. 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 tables and/or graphs. 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. Please recognize that the standard deviation of most IDEA scores (for $n > 10$) lies between 0.5-1.0, so subtle changes in scores are not significant and should not be fretted over or touted (i.e., with an average score of 3.9 ± 1.0 , we are confident that two-thirds of all student responses lie between 2.9 and 4.9).

In evaluating your portfolio, FRC considers three performance criteria:

The first of these criteria is *teaching effectiveness*, which also includes any student advising and mentoring that you may have done. FRC 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. Another measure is student course evaluations (Student Ratings of Instruction, SRIs; currently the IDEA form). Evidence of student learning is the most important

element of a case for teaching effectiveness but is often the hardest component to assess.

The second criterion is *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 *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 FRC 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; FRC 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.

Reflecting upon Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Issues

Now that the Augustana Faculty has passed the DEI tenure and promotion expectations (May 12, 2021 full faculty meeting; see minutes in Sept. 1, 2021 meeting documents), we would like you to address one or both of these questions (based on the DEI document) in your narrative:

1. How is a commitment to diversity and inclusion apparent in your work at Augustana?
2. How have you developed your skills and abilities related to diversity and inclusion?

The work on diversity, equity, and inclusion takes time. We understand that some of you may have just begun to think about it and may not have had the time to implement your ideas yet. Some of you already have a framework since that is an integral part of your teaching at Augustana. We welcome a variety of reflections.

What materials should be submitted for your review:

1. A hard copy of the “Checklist for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reviews” form
2. Three or six hard copies of your primary, core review materials packet – depending on whether you're being considered for promotion or not – (stapled, bound or 3-ring binder) that includes:

- Your updated curriculum vitae
- Your 5- to 7-page case-making narrative on your teaching and advising, scholarship and service since you arrived at Augustana. Address prior FRC-suggested areas for improvement. Include analysis of IDEA score trends, ideally with tables and/or graphs (with n=# respondents/total students).

(NOTE: copies of IDEA forms themselves should only be electronically submitted; see below)

3. In addition to the three or six hard copies, please provide one electronic version of the same primary review materials (CV & Case-Making Narrative) and IDEA Folder with all IDEA forms. Upload the well-organized materials comprising your portfolio into your Google Drive folder and share them with your Departmental Chair, all tenured members of your department and *BOTH* facultyreview@augustana.edu AND facultyreviewcommitteegroup@augustana.edu (one site is for archiving and the other is for distribution to committee members). Please 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 can be labeled & organized any way you see fit. Note that if this review is for promotion, the tenured members in your department need to be kept apprised of your progress, since their input is required in the Department Chair's letter of support.

4. One electronic copy of supplemental materials, in well-organized and clearly labeled folders within your main Google Drive portfolio folder. As a subfolder within your main portfolio folder, your supplemental materials can be labeled and organized any way you see fit. Include an inventory of your supporting materials (i.e., a table of contents list); in addition, you must tell us why you are including them – *why* are they important to your case-making narrative; it would be useful to add these elaborations to both your narrative and the inventory list. The quantity of supporting materials should be great enough to give a reviewer the ability to draw a full and accurate picture of your career, but a few exemplars are always preferred to an overabundance of repetition.

- Individual complete IDEA forms with student comments (the summarizing tables, graphs and analysis of these data must be part of your case-making statement), organized by course, then chronologically. Please include summary reports for all sections you have taught.
- 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, as well.
- Syllabi (both for courses and for advising)
- Evidence of advising engagement and/or effectiveness
- 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.
- 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 Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, and assure them that their letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.

5. Your Department Chair should electronically submit the Department Chair's letter of support and all annual review letters to *BOTH* facultyreview@augustana.edu *AND* facultyreviewcommitteegroup@augustana.edu. You should remind them to do so in a timely manner.

Time-line for submission 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.

The review

The review will consist of you, your Department Chair, and FRC members (3 or 6, 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 FRC 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 Review Committee, and to answer any questions they may have.

Letter & follow-up conversation (“debrief”)

The Faculty Review 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 one member of FRC, vetted by the rest of FRC and signed by the FRC 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, FRC division representative, Chair of the Faculty Review 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 FRC'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, FRC division representative, and/or the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee for help with any questions or concerns you may have.