

## BEST PRACTICES FOR SUCCESSFUL PREPARATION AND REVIEW OF TERM FACULTY ADVANCEMENT CASES

### For department chairs/school directors and deans:

- Department chairs/school directors have the overall responsibility for their department/school's (heretofore referred to as department) term faculty advancement process.
- Department chairs/school directors should understand and follow department governance as well as college policies and Faculty Handbook guidance (FH 5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty Appointments).
- Department chairs/school directors communicate format, process, and timeline for the preparation of term advancement portfolios that are timely and meet department, college, and university guidelines.
- The dean's and department chair/school director's review letters must be analytical, candid, and evaluative. Deans and department chairs/school directors should point out, discuss, and analyze any strengths and weaknesses in the case, and any aspects of the process that are unusual or of concern. The following format is suggested: 1) timing of the case for advancement, 2) description of the review process; 3) synopsis of case; 4) evaluation of any concerns; and 5) recommendation on the case.

### For candidates:

- Candidates must use their college's templates and guidelines.
- Candidates are expected to provide an advancement dossier that aligns with their Position Responsibility Statement (PRS) and demonstrates the quality and effectiveness of their work. The PRS should accurately reflect the expectations for each area of responsibility, preferably using weighted percentages. The PRS serves as the benchmark for gauging faculty effectiveness when evaluating term faculty advancement portfolios.
- Candidates will prepare and submit the following materials: the university cover sheet; all PRSs or affiliation agreements (for affiliate faculty only) from the period of review, current curriculum vitae, and a narrative summary of the candidate's accomplishments.

## BEST PRACTICES FOR SUCCESSFUL PREPARATION AND REVIEW OF TERM FACULTY ADVANCEMENT CASES

- Teaching loads vary across disciplines and within departments. The advancement materials should accurately reflect a candidate's actual teaching load and be consistent with actual teaching activity reported for recent years, not the department average. Where a candidate's teaching load diverges significantly from the departmental norm, this divergence should be clearly explained.
- Student ratings of teaching scores presented in tabular format should be included in the narrative summary. Ratings should be forwarded using the institutional standard of 1=very poor and 5=excellent. Comparative department data must be provided. Candidates should proactively address any negative trends in their teaching evaluation record, particularly sustained deviations from the department average.
- Other ways to document one's teaching are available through the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching.
- Refer to the Faculty Handbook (FH 5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty Appointments) as well as your college and department governance documents for additional guidance on the nature and course of the review process, from department through the college and the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.