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

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

Updated: March 2021

Table of Contents

Purpose of a Term Faculty Reviews 2

- Annual performance review 2
- Review for renewal 2
- Advancement review 2

Process for a Term Renewal Review 3

- Timeline 3
- Review Materials..... 3
- Department Review Committee and Evaluation Letter 3
- Department Chair’s Review and Contract Renewal 4

Process for an Advancement Review 5

- Timeline 5
- Review Materials..... 5
- Department Review Committee and Evaluation Letter 6
- Department Chair’s Review and Evaluation Letter 6

 - Notification 6

- Dean’s Review and Evaluation Letter..... 6

 - Notification 6

Additional Resources 7

- Deadline Calendar – Renewal 7
- Deadline Calendar – Advancement..... 7
- College’s Promotion and Tenure Vita Guidelines 7
- Section 2 Formatting..... 8

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 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 for Personnel.

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 Performance reviews
- Departmental Review for renewal of appointment
- 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. In addition to the department's standard annual performance review process, it is best practice for the department chair and faculty member to discuss the timeline for renewal and/or 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 (at the same rank or higher). Typically, this review takes place every three years (refer to the Faculty Handbook as well as college and departmental governance documents for specific conditions).

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. Typically, this review takes place every three years (refer to the Faculty Handbook as well as college and departmental governance documents for specific conditions). 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 by March 15th one year prior to renewal, unless otherwise noted in the departmental governance document. The Departmental Partner will 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.

- Section 1, reviewed for accuracy by the department chair
 - All Position Responsibility Statements (PRS) since initial appointment or last review
 - 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](#).
 - Included within the 10 pages should be a numerical summary of teaching evaluations since the last advancement or previous 5 of years.

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

Department Review Committee and Evaluation Letter

The departmental review committee is composed of term faculty of equal or greater rank (unless stipulated by departmental governance document). When there are not enough term faculty of equal or greater rank in a department to constitute a committee, term faculty from other departments may serve on the committee. Where needed, tenure and tenure track faculty may also serve. The committee 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 or recitation of the CV. 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 committee evaluates the evidence provided by the candidate relative to the PRS. The committee provides a document to

the department chair and discusses the findings and advises the chair. 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. Results of the review and recommendations must be provided to the faculty member as soon as practical. The department chair will then work with the HR Coordinator to route the renewal (or non-renewal) documents, as applicable.

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 and department 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 November 1st. The departmental representative (typically departmental admin or chair of the review committee) 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.

- 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](#).
 - Included within the 10 pages should be a numerical summary of teaching evaluations since the last advancement or previous 5 of years.
- Section 3
 - Optional supplementary portfolio of selected works in support of Section 2, not to exceed an additional 15 pages. 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. Refer to the CELT Guidance regarding teaching examples for a teaching portfolio. Practice, research can follow a similar format.

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

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 committee evaluates the evidence provided by the candidate relative to the PRS. The committee provides a document to the department chair and discusses the findings and makes a recommendation.

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.

Notification

The chair will inform the candidate in writing before the department's recommendations are submitted to the college, as soon as practical.

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, the feedback 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

March 15 th	Term Faculty member submits Renewal Review Packet to Departmental Partner and departmental review begins. Department committee writes a letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair
April 15 th	Departmental review letter due to Department Chair for review
April 30 th	Department Chair submits contract renewal documents to HR Coordinator, if applicable
May 15 th	Deadline for renewal contract or notice of non-renewal to be sent

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

Deadline Calendar – Advancement

November 1 st	Term faculty member submits Advancement Review Packet to Departmental Partner and departmental review begins.
December 1 st	Departmental letter of evaluation, addressed to the department chair, submitted. Department Chair review begins.
February 1 st	Review Packet submitted to Dean for review.
February 28 th	Dean notifies candidate in writing of recommendation.
March 1 st	Final decision is forwarded to the Provost Office

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

College's Promotion and Tenure Vita Guidelines

Select areas that apply to your PRS. Please note that the section on Scholarship is optional as most Term faculty are not evaluated on scholarship. Only those sections of the vita that are relevant to your PRS are primarily evaluated. Please see this link to the guidelines. <http://www.design.iastate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CoD-Vita-Guidelines-March-2017-FDC-Final.docx>

Section 2 Formatting

Section 2 – Summary of candidate accomplishments – comprises up to 10 pages in which candidates make their case for promotion. Section 2 is the primary text used by departmental and college reviewers, and the Provost to review the advancement cases. It is the primary means of demonstrating that the criteria for advancement, as defined in the ISU Faculty Handbook, the College of Design Governance Document, and one’s departmental governance document, have been met.

Key elements are:

- Candidate Statement on Scholarship where the case for national distinction is articulated.
- Summary of Accomplishments and Impacts.
- Sections on each area of one’s PRS to establish effectiveness in the following order: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, Extension/Professional Practice/Engagement, and Institutional Service.

Section 2 need not repeat information included in the CV and should focus on work accomplished during this evaluation period or since one’s last promotion. Section 2 must follow the outline below using the same titles and order. Italicized text is included for guidance and should not be include in the version submitted. Section 2 must not exceed 10 pages in length including the “table of courses taught.” The “table of courses taught” will be prepared and provided by staff in the college’s Administrative Services Office. Questions about this table should be referred to the college’s HR Liaison. Cover pages and table of contents are unnecessary and reduce the number of pages available for text. Please use 10 point or larger text and include page numbers.

Date:

Name:

Department:

Current Rank:

1. Candidate Statement on Scholarship

Provide a statement describing your scholarship which weaves together all of your areas of performance into a coherent narrative and highlights your most significant contributions to your field.

Section 5.2.2.2 of the ISU Faculty Handbook defines scholarship as encompassing research, creative activities, teaching, extension, and professional practice.

2. Summary of Accomplishments and Impacts

Summarize the most significant and impactful accomplishments in all areas of responsibility and describes the quality and audience of venues in which your work has been published, exhibited, presented, etc. Highlight works that best illustrate excellence in scholarship as well as any awards, honors, etc. received for this work.

3. Teaching

ISU Faculty Handbook Section 5.2.2.3 defines teaching including the scholarship of teaching and learning.

A. Responsibilities

Summarize your responsibilities for teaching, advising undergraduate students, and advising graduate students as defined in your PRS.

B. Teaching Philosophy

C. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe the most impactful accomplishments in teaching and advising, e.g. textbooks authored, innovative teaching methods developed, assessment methods developed, courses developed, curriculum development work, advising undergraduate and graduate students, etc.

D. Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

A table that includes all courses you taught during this review period with student ratings of teaching effectiveness will be prepared by college staff using the format shown below and provided to you as a PDF for inclusion in this Portfolio Summary. This table can be attached to the end of the Portfolio Summary but will be included in the 25-page count. For faculty seeking promotion to full professor, this table will include courses taught during the last seven years. Use this section to discuss any courses where instructor/course ratings are lower than departmental averages.

Term – most recent first	Course Number	Course Title	Enrollment	Number who Responded	Credits	Contact Hours	Instructor Overall Rating*	Dept. Average*	College Average*	Course Overall Rating*	Dept. Average*	College Average*

* 5 = excellent, 1 = very poor

E. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, organizations, and events related to teaching.

F. Other Assessments of Teaching and Advising Effectiveness

Describe other external measures of teaching and advising effectiveness, e.g. peer evaluation of teaching, awards, honors, presentations on teaching methods, awards received by students for work completed under your supervision, etc.

4. Research/Creative Activities

ISU Faculty Handbook Section 5.2.2.4 defines Research/Creative Activities.

A. Area(s) of Focus

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe in detail the most impactful accomplishment in research/creative activities along with importance of the peer-reviewed venues in which the work was published, presented, exhibited, etc. Report impact and citation metrics for publications, exhibitions, completed works, etc. when available. Describe sponsored funding supporting research/creative activities and the significance of the funding organization.

C. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, journals, foundations, organizations, and events related to research/creative activities.

D. Other External Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe other external measures of excellence and impact, e.g. awards, honors, patents, invitations to present/exhibit work, etc.

5. Extension/Professional Practice/Engagement

Include this section only if it is an element in your PRS.

ISU Faculty Handbook section 5.2.2.5 defines Extension/Professional Practice. In addition to this definition, the college also recognizes “engagement” as part of this area. Community Engagement as defined by Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement is “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” Source: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, Community Engagement Classification (http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=618)

A. Area(s) of Responsibility

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe in detail the most impactful accomplishment in extension/professional practice/engagement along with importance of the peer-reviewed venues in which the work was published, presented, exhibited, etc. Report impact and citation metrics for publications, exhibitions, completed works, etc. when available. Describe impact of the work on communities, organizations, the general public, etc.

Describe sponsored funding/commissions supporting extension/professional practice/engagement and the significance of the funding organization.

C. Service

Describe leadership positions and/or service in professional societies, organizations, communities, governmental agencies, and events related to extension/professional practice/engagement.

D. Other External Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe other external measures of excellence and impact, e.g. awards, honors, invitations to present/exhibit work, etc.

6. Administration

Included only if administration is a PRS element.

A. Areas of Responsibility

B. Accomplishments and Impacts

C. Measures of Excellence and Impact

7. Institutional Service

ISU Faculty Handbook section 5.2.2.6 defines institutional service.

A. Institutional Service Accomplishments and Impacts

Describe the most impactful accomplishments in institutional service including leadership roles on significant department/college/university councils/committees, search committees, accreditation preparation teams, etc.

B. Measures of Excellence and Impact

Describe honors, awards, etc. received for service.