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Our Goals with the Reappointment Process

The current reappointment process we have in place was initiated to standardize the process across the college and improve outcomes for the individuals involved and the departments they are supporting. For tenure-track faculty, goals are to guide the faculty member through the process as smoothly as possible, to allow them to build their case gradually, and provide routine feedback on progress and the presentation of that progress. For continuing lecturers, the intent is similar, with incorporation of a brief reappointment process once a multi-year pattern of satisfactory performance is documented.

General Observations

1. The large majority of probationary faculty and continuing lecturers are using the college reappointment document as expected.
2. Third-year review recommendations must come from the same committee which handles P&T for the department. If the department has a different reappointment committee, that is not the proper (under SD 88-13) recommending body for third-year review.
3. Formatting issues:
   a. Faculty continue to vary in whether they report events in chronological or reverse chronological order. OAA 99-1 requests reverse chronological order, and that is the format that we also request.
   b. Make sure to **bold** new information (if the department has a different process for third year review it can be substituted that year, but otherwise highlight new info).
   c. Begin the document with the page that includes the person’s name; cut the earlier pages out of the personal reappointment document.
   d. Some of these documents are becoming rather long (longer than necessary?). Keep in mind that the entire p&t dossier is limited to 30 pages, and these documents can be considerably briefer than that.
   e. The teaching or research box in the COAS doc is a checkable box. Just click on it, and it will open and give you the opportunity to select “checked.” Don’t try to manually enter a check into the box.

Documenting teaching for reappointment

1. For continuing lecturers and tenure-track faculty who expect to seek competence in teaching, documenting high quality teaching using “multiple measures” is required. What does that mean? In addition to collecting, reporting upon and reflecting upon standardized student evaluations, peer evaluation should also be included. Examples include peer review and subsequent **reflection** on how such information has been used to improve or enhance one’s teaching. Faculty often also include participation in (and reflection on) activities devoted to teaching improvement (e.g., teaching workshops, conferences devoted to pedagogy, seeking the advice of mentors, reading pedagogical scholarship), supervision of student research, and
new contributions to the curriculum. Other measures of documenting teaching are encouraged, and examples can be found in the OAA Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format Guidelines, OAA 99-1, and in the “Examples for Documenting and Evaluating Teaching” on the OAA website.

2. Reflection on teaching should be in the reappointment document itself, not in an appendix. It should be brief and evolve over time between reappointments.

3. For tenure-track faculty, student evaluations should be presented in cumulative tables of evaluations building throughout the probationary period. For continuing lecturers, student evaluations should be in cumulative tables building over the first five reappointments. All evaluations should be in reverse chronological order, typically organized by course or type of course, with new ones bolded or highlighted.

4. These tables of student evaluations should be in the document itself not in an appendix.

5. Occasionally faculty presented only one numeric student evaluation item – a mean of all the items used in all courses – just a single number (e.g., 4.3). Such an approach is of little value and not informative – keep scores for individual questions separate.

6. If the department has a long instrument, a selection of items is sufficient. Multiple tables of a large number of items is less than ideal. However, if a subset of items is chosen, the faculty member should explain why the particular items were selected. Consistency for items chosen by faculty from a single department is desirable.

7. Include some student evaluation norms for the department for comparative purposes.

8. Previously we have suggested that departments consider how student evaluations reflect competent or excellent teaching, noting that student evaluations are a measure of student satisfaction, not learning. Although useful, department norms are probably not the definitive standard of either competence or excellence, but the department may wish to decide what is.

9. It is generally expected that probationary faculty members and continuing lecturers who are early in their time at IPFW will have and will document peer observations of teaching. Ideally, an untenured faculty member should have a peer teaching mentor (or perhaps more than one) with whom they can develop a relationship, and who can provide at regular intervals, reports about the untenured faculty member’s progress in teaching, as well as information about change over time. Class visits should be documented (date, class, peer visitor), and occasional reports from peer visitors may be included with the materials submitted to the college with the reappointment. We encourage faculty to reflect on how the peer visits have helped them develop as teachers.

10. CELT has available a formative peer review process that faculty who want to learn more about their teaching can use, and can reflect upon. However, CELT reviewers are generally unwilling to provide evaluative (summative) reviews of teaching. If one wants that, and most probationary faculty and some continuing lecturers probably do, they probably need to seek it elsewhere. FACET can refer junior faculty to skilled peer mentors willing to provide summative review.

11. Online courses are often evaluated only via the DCS measure. It is recommended that departments evaluate their own online courses with their own instrument, and that they take whatever steps they can to increase response rates. Response rates below 60 to 70% of enrolled students are not representative enough to use to make judgments about effective teaching. This can be a serious concern when the faculty member teaches much of their load online.
12. Please avoid long strings of student quotes; a short summary of representative comments is adequate if you wish to provide comments.

13. Previous narrative reflections, student comments, and peer comments don’t need to be retained in detail from one year to the next. We do want to see the survey items listed cumulatively (i.e., in tables of student evaluations), but the narratives can be redone each year.

**Documenting research for reappointment**

1. Only scholarship completed (or in progress) while a member of the faculty at IPFW should be listed on the reappointment document. Earlier scholarship should be on the cv. (which is also to be attached). This does not imply that earlier scholarship will not be part of the faculty member’s case at tenure time; only that the reappointment process is focused on documenting continuing achievement.

2. Do include a description of research in progress.

3. Chairs and probationary faculty should also be careful to specify what progress has been made in scholarship since the last reappointment, as well as overall progress.

**Documenting service for reappointment**

1. The probationary period is a time to socialize faculty into their roles as university citizens, thus the college encourages modest service outside the department for untenured faculty, especially as they near promotion and tenure. In addition to committee service, there are several one-time, low-demand events that junior faculty may be encouraged to take part in and document as a way of building a modest record of service outside the department.

2. For probationary faculty, a “service arc” may be considered, with minimal service early in the probationary period, extending outside the department to the university, community and/or to the profession as tenure time approaches.

3. Continuing lecturers are expected to engage in some service, and service outside the department is encouraged, especially service in support of teaching and students. This varies considerably across departments.

**New process for continuing lecturers, beginning 2013-14**

We established a practice of reappointing continuing lecturers using the college reappointment document for the first five years of their service as continuing lecturers. For these early reappointments, the college expects a detailed reappointment document, with a cumulative record of teaching, research, and service for their time in the position. Once the continuing lecturer has been reappointed five times, at the sixth reappointment and beyond COAS continuing lecturers will switch to a brief reappointment process, unless the department chair or the dean requests a detailed reappointment. For the brief process, the continuing lecturer will submit a cv to accompany the reappointment, and the chair and dean will write a brief reappointment recommendation indicating that performance continues to be satisfactory. If the chair or dean believes that a more extensive process is necessary for a particular continuing lecturer, they may agree to implement it. Although not part of the reappointment process per se, continuing lecturers would receive a detailed annual performance evaluation at the department level, as expected for all faculty.