Review Process for Professional Track Faculty

The Moody College employs many faculty who work in professional track positions ("teaching faculty," formerly called "non-tenure track"), with a wide variety of responsibilities and expectations. Some are employed on a part-time or temporary basis, while others are considered full-time. These hiring determinations are primarily made by departments.

For those instructors who are considered part-time and as temporary instructors, assessments are made each semester through departmental leadership primarily on their teaching effectiveness and considering departmental curricular needs. Department chairs and school directors are expected to offer clear expectations and terms of employment with each instructor.

Some professional track faculty are employed on a full-time basis, and are expected to continue in their positions for a significant period of time. These may include Lecturer, Instruction, Practice, or Clinical title tracks. Higher ranks generally carry longer-term commitments. These faculty are expected to work at least one year, with duration specified by departments and schools. A full-time load is typically considered to be three courses per semester. The Dean has determined that anyone who is appointed at least 66.67 percent time or more (two courses per semester), is considered a full-time professional track faculty member.

Professional faculty are evaluated on an annual basis, and offered feedback, through processes similar to that of other instructor assessments through department and school leadership and councils. In addition to this annual review, professional faculty are assessed through a third-year review process, similar to those conducted with Assistant Professors on the tenure track. These reviews are to be conducted in the sixth semester of continuous employment in conjunction with the annual review process. Third-year reviews should consider indicators of teaching effectiveness (including course instructor surveys, at least two peer teaching reviews, or other measures determined by departments and schools); other areas of importance to the department or school (such as professional productivity or service) provided they were articulated in the appointment letter; and other areas with relevance to program needs. If the instructor has pursued promotion during the period, that process takes the place of this review.

Reviews are used to determine reappointments of professional track faculty members and in some cases to identify candidates for promotion consideration (e.g., Lecturer to Senior Lecturer). Unless serious issues cause concern or suggest that immediate improvements are needed, the next comprehensive review term is scheduled on a three-year cycle. If serious concerns are identified, the case should be revisited and direction will be given in the evaluation as to needed improvements and specific next steps to evaluate progress. The outcome of this evaluation may also lead to non-renewal of the appointment. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories for each area of work being assessed (e.g., teaching, service, research, etc.), and also an overall review summarizing their overall work in all areas being evaluated.

- **Exceeds expectations** – a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
- **Meets expectations** – normally expected level of accomplishment.
- **Does not meet expectations** – a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.

If a response to the evaluation from the faculty member being reviewed is submitted, it should be kept on file with the third-year evaluation from the Chair /Director. In any case, a report on each Professional Track Third-Year Review must be provided to the Director of Faculty Advancement in the Dean’s Office, including the review, a description of the process, the proposed term of reappointment, and any response from the faculty. Deadline to submit the report materials to the Director of Faculty Advancement will be May 15 each year. Once this is approved, a letter of reappointment can be sent to the faculty member.

**Process:**

1. During the spring semester of the second year of employment (or fourth semester), the Director of Faculty Advancement will meet with each Administrative Manager and each Chair or Director to review and identify those who will be engaging in third-year reviews in the upcoming year. These lists will be finalized by the end of February in the spring semester.
2. Based on these lists, the Dean’s Office will submit a request to the Provost’s Office for instructor records to be used in the third-year review assessments.
3. The faculty member should submit all relevant materials along with annual reports in the time period designated by the Department/School, in consultation with Departmental/School leadership.
4. Each Department/School will review materials submitted for third-year reviews no later than the end of each April. Departments/Schools may choose to have the full EBC perform the review or may create a sub-committee to conduct the review to ensure the review is fair, accurate, ethical, and informed. It is important that reviewers are not in conflict with the person under review (e.g., former advisor or mentor, regular collaborator, etc.); those in conflict should recuse themselves from participation.
5. Each Department/School will write a brief assessment to the faculty member of the process engaged in the review, and an evaluative and developmental review of the faculty member’s teaching, and other areas of evaluation. These reports are typically no longer than three pages. The Assessment Outcomes listed above should be used by the Department/School to assess each of the two areas, each with their own outcomes, but there also must be one overall outcome summarizing the comprehensive work of the faculty member.
6. A copy of these final reports is forwarded to the Director of Faculty Advancement in the Dean’s Office, no later than May 15th or the corresponding date in the sixth semester. The reports will then be forwarded to the Dean and Associate Dean with all college reviews.
7. The reports are given to the faculty member being reviewed, who has the right to submit a formal response within ten (10) working days of receiving the written evaluation results of their review, and if done, it will become part of the third-year review document and should accompany the evaluation to the Dean’s Office via the Director of Faculty Advancement.
8. Chairs/Directors (or their designate) discuss reviews with the faculty member in person.
9. Negative reviews (i.e., “does not meet expectations”) must be discussed with the Dean by the Chair/Director.
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