

**Timeline, Process, and Common Format  
for Instructor Promotion Reviews in 2009 - 2010**  
Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, prepared 6/27/09

The Board of Visitors approved the career ladder for instructors at their meeting in June 2007. In addition they approved employment policies for non-tenure-track faculty that affect instructors, but also other types of faculty members, such as the clinical faculty. This material is now incorporated in sections 2.3.1.6 and 2.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

While the new policy provides general guidance on how promotions will be reviewed at various levels, there are a number of questions that need to be discussed and resolved by departments and colleges that will be involved in recommending or reviewing instructor promotions. The outcomes of those discussions will very likely result in varied practices, both transitional and permanent, since the number of instructors is small in some colleges and substantial in others. This document lays out a proposed time line and guidelines for the promotion reviews. The common university dossier format and departmental guidelines prepared by the Department of English for possible adaptation by other departments are available on the provost's website.

**2009 – 2010 Timeline**

July 15, 2009	The common dossier format will be distributed to departments for use by candidates.
Fall 2009	Departments set their own deadlines for dossier submission by those who wish to be considered for promotion during 2009-10.
Date determined by dept.	Departmental committee reviews instructor promotion dossiers and makes written recommendations to the department head.
Date determined by college	Department head reviews instructor promotion dossiers and prepares written recommendations to the dean/college committee.
Date determined by college	A positive recommendation from either or both the departmental committee and department head advances the case to the college committee for consideration.
Date determined by college	College committees convene to review and make promotion recommendations to the dean.
March 1, 2010	A positive recommendation from either or both the dean and college committee advances the case to the provost for consideration.
April 23, 2010	Provost reviews and finalizes recommendations to the president and Board of Visitors. (This is an administrative review and promotion process since the dossiers do not go before a university-level review committee. Each dossier is reviewed at three levels—departmental, college, and provost—before being recommended to the president and Board of Visitors.)
June 2010	Board of Visitors considers recommended instructor promotions along with promotions for tenure-track faculty, continued appointment faculty, and for extension agents and library assistant professors.
August 10, 2010	Promotion adjustments go into effect for academic year instructors. (July 1 is the effective date for calendar year instructors.)

## **Process Guidelines**

- The instructor career ladder review is intended to provide a practical and equitable process to validate the significant work of instructors, to reward academic excellence, and to provide greater job security for those with regular on-going appointments. The 2007-08 academic year was the initial review year for the first cohort of instructor promotions.
- The salary increase from instructor to advanced instructor is \$2,000. The salary increase from advanced instructor to senior instructor is \$3,000. Adjustments will be proportional for part-time faculty members. Promotion adjustments will be the responsibility of the colleges.

## **Promotion Dossier**

- A candidate may find it beneficial to share a draft version of his or her dossier (especially the candidate's statement) with colleagues. Seeking comments or critiques may result in a stronger dossier and case for promotion. Members of the promotion review committee should not participate in the critiquing exercise.
- Instructors seeking promotion are expected to develop a dossier summarizing their accomplishments using the common university format. The common university dossier format may be found at the end of this document. It is also available on the provost's website at [www.provost.vt.edu](http://www.provost.vt.edu).
- The dossier format will be reviewed annually following the promotion process to determine if revisions should be made.
- Departments may request supplemental material and provide further guidance to candidates for dossier preparation so that the dossier submission adequately serves departmental needs and appropriately conveys the accomplishments of the candidates.

## **Years of Service**

- Instructors must be on regular appointments to be considered for promotion. See section 2.3.1.6 of the *Faculty Handbook*. However, prior years of service on a restricted appointment at Virginia Tech may count toward the years of service required for promotion.
- Faculty members should have *completed* five years before consideration for promotion to advanced instructor and 10 years prior to consideration for promotion to senior instructor. (Promotion review would thus occur during the 6<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> year respectively.) These are minimal expectations for years of service.
- After the initial two-year transition period (2007-08 and 2008-09), "jumping" from instructor to senior instructor is not anticipated.
- Instructors who have accumulated more than five years, but less than 10, may be considered for promotion to advanced instructor. Up to three years of Virginia Tech service may then be credited toward a subsequent promotion to senior instructor.
- An individual hired into an instructor position may count as many as three years of service related to instruction at another institution toward the designated period required prior to review for promotion in rank. For example, instructors with three years of prior service credit may come forward for promotion to advanced instructor during their third year of service at Virginia Tech, which will satisfy the minimum of five years completed service prior to consideration for promotion.
- An individual may be hired at a rank higher than the entry-level instructor rank. For example, an instructor with 20 years' instructional service at another institution may qualify initially for employment as a senior instructor; however, such a hire requires the prior approval of the department head and dean.

### Departmental Guidelines and Processes

- Departments have developed written guidelines, including the criteria for promotion, the procedures that will be followed, and the membership of the review committee. These documents have been approved by the department (all faculty or the departmental P&T committee, plus the department head). They have also been approved by the college P&T committee and the dean.
- Each department may adopt its own criteria and guidelines for instructor promotions. Consistency across departments within a college is strongly encouraged. Consistency with overall criteria for each rank as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* is required.
- Colleges with a small number of instructors may wish to adopt a common set of guidelines for all departments in the college.
- It is the responsibility of the departmental committee chair (or members or designee, depending on departmental practice) to prepare a thorough summary of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and to reflect the evaluation of the credentials by the committee. The letter of the department head need not repeat this information, but may be a relatively brief statement from the department head's perspective, along with the recommendation. Obviously a decision that is not in agreement with the committee decision should be more fully explicated and justified.
- For instructors who have a joint appointment, the instructor follows the guidelines of his or her "home" department. (For example, if the appointment is  $\frac{3}{4}$  in one department +  $\frac{1}{4}$  in another, the home department is the  $\frac{3}{4}$  department.) The home departmental review committee is expected to seek input from the other department.

### College Committee Membership and Processes

- The timeline above assumes that the departmental and college-level P&T committees would complete their review of the tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure dossiers before considering instructor dossiers. If a college prefers to review the instructor dossiers at the same time they review dossiers for tenure-track faculty, it is free to do so.
- Given that some college-level P&T committees are very large and contain representatives from departments that do not have instructor appointments, it seems reasonable that a subcommittee be charged with such responsibility. The subcommittee would be three to five faculty members appointed by the dean and drawn from the current membership of the regular college P&T committee. The majority of subcommittee members will represent departments with instructor appointments, whether or not there are any candidates from that department that year. Appointment of department heads should be avoided, given the small size of the subcommittee and the requirement for a separate recommendation from the relevant heads or chairs.
- It is expected that by 2009-10, each college must have an established, documented process for determining the membership and procedures for college-level review of instructor promotions. For those colleges with larger numbers of instructors, a special committee may be formed with substantial instructor participation.
- Letters recommending promotion from college-level committees and from the dean may be succinct and need not repeat material well summarized at the departmental level. Instructors who are not recommended for promotion should receive written feedback on issues of concern.

## **Common Format for Instructor Promotion Dossiers, 2009-10**

All candidate dossiers are submitted to the Instructor Promotion Committee according to the following guidelines.

### Cover Page

The cover page is available on the provost's website at [www.provost.vt.edu](http://www.provost.vt.edu).

### Document Format

- font type of either Verdana or Arial
- minimum font size of 11
- single-space the text
- double-space between paragraphs
- margins of 1-inch left/right and top/bottom
- page numbers in the upper right-hand corner
- ***please note:*** the instructor promotion dossiers are *not* reviewed as PDF documents; therefore, insertion of page numbers such as "1a" is allowed.

### Table of Contents

- Recognizing that instructors make valuable contributions across a broad spectrum of activities, the dossier contains categories that will not apply to all candidates. If a section is not applicable to a candidate's dossier, please exclude it from the Table of Contents and do not address it within the body of the dossier.
- A candidate should create his or her own selective Table of Contents, i.e., exclude entries in the Table of Contents and body that are not applicable.

### Specific Instructions

- The candidate's portion of the dossier (sections V. – XII.) should not exceed 10 pages in length.
- The cover page, table of contents, recommendation statements, and appendices are not included in the above-mentioned 10-page limit.
- Include as appendices only those items specifically required in the dossier instructions.

### Sections

- I. Dean's Statement: The dean provides a simple, brief statement of support. If the dean does not support the case, his or her decision should be more fully explicated and justified. Instructors who are not recommended for promotion should receive written feedback on issues of concern.
- II. College Review Committee's Statement: Letters from the college-level committee are succinct and need not repeat material well summarized at the departmental level. The statement from the college committee includes the division of the vote. If the vote is not unanimous, a brief explanation of the concerns represented by the dissenting votes is included in the college committee's statement.
- III. Department Head's Statement: The letter of the department head does not repeat the departmental review committee's assessment, but is a relatively brief statement from the department head's perspective, along with his or her recommendation. Obviously a decision that is not in agreement with the committee decision should be more fully explicated and justified.

- IV. Departmental Review Committee's Statement: The statement from the departmental committee is detailed. It is an informative, individualized assessment of the candidate's activities and contributions, and provides the committee's evaluation. The statement includes the division of the vote. If the vote is not unanimous, a brief explanation of the concerns represented by the dissenting votes is included in the departmental committee's statement.
- V. Candidate's Statement: The candidate's statement is no more than one or two pages in length. The statement enables members of the promotion committee to understand clearly the candidate's contributions to department program(s). The candidate may wish to include in the narrative a statement of his or her philosophy of teaching. The candidate's statement explains but does not evaluate the work. The statement identifies the criteria the candidate is using to claim eligibility for promotion. (A current curriculum vita is attached as Appendix A, and is not included in the 10-page limit for sections V. – XII.).
- VI. Evidence of Exemplary Instruction: Instruction is a multifaceted activity. In any assessment of a candidate for promotion both the quality and the quantity of the individual's achievements in instruction are presented in the dossier.

The promotion dossier provides the following information about instruction:

- A. A list of *unique* course titles (and course numbers) taught since the last promotion or, at a minimum, for the last five years. Indicate the number of times each course was taught during the period and any special aspects, such as on-line, writing intensive, or service-learning. [A complete chronology of all courses taught by term is required as part of section VI.C. below and need not be repeated here.]
- B. A chronological list of non-credit courses taught, workshops led, and other related outreach instruction since the last promotion or, at a minimum for the last five years.
- C. Evidence of instructional effectiveness. The following evidence should be included if applicable:
1. Annual end-of-year departmental evaluations for the most recent three years or since the last promotion. (This is attached as Appendix B, and is not included in the 10-page limit for sections V. – XII.).
  2. Provide a table showing all classes taught for the past five years with the students' perception of teaching. Any classes not evaluated should be noted in the table. (This is attached as Appendix C, and is not included in the 10-page limit for sections V. – XII.).

The table includes:

- name, term and year for each course taught,
- number of students in each course,
- number of students completing the evaluation, and
- student ratings. If the standard university evaluation form, Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT), is used, the table should include at least scores for the overall student rating, success in communicating, and concern and respect for the student.
- departmental average ratings for similar courses

If the SPOT form is not used, then the form used to acquire student perceptions must be included with the dossier. Explain the rating scale used, or the meaning of any data, information, or examples included as evidence of effective instruction.

3. Evaluations of non-credit courses or other outreach instruction, which should include participant data as defined above and evidence of the impact of programs on participants.

4. Success in non-classroom activities, such as online courses, Math Emporium instruction, etc.
5. Peer evaluations of instruction. Provide at least two peer reviewers' reports, at least one of which must have been completed within the last five years. (This is attached as Appendix D, and is not included in the 10-page limit for sections V. – XII.).

If the department does not conduct peer reviews of teaching, the department head will explain why in his or her recommendation letter.

6. Recognition and awards for teaching effectiveness, if applicable.
7. Other: Additional evidence of outstanding teaching may be included at the candidate's discretion as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit. If student comments or letters are included, describe how the comments were solicited or obtained.

VII. Evidence of Extended Professional Development or Professional Development Beyond the Department

For each of the items included, provide dates, context, and a brief assessment of the significance and impact of the activities.

- A. Participation in departmental or university workshops or study groups.
- B. Completion of courses or short courses related to pedagogy.
- C. Participation in professional conferences.
- D. Other: Additional evidence of extended professional development may be added at the candidate's discretion as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit.

VIII. Course or Curricular Development

For each of the items included, provide dates, context, and a brief assessment of the significance and impact of the work. It is expected that all teachers will revise their courses regularly. Please show how each item listed below goes beyond this normal expectation.

- A. Development of new courses.
- B. Instructional materials made available to others beyond the instructor's own classes (e.g. online materials, contributions to a departmental-produced text).
- C. Incorporation of new technologies or pedagogies.
- D. Other: Additional evidence of course or curricular development may be added at the candidate's discretion as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit.

IX. Advising or Mentoring

For each of the items included, provide dates, context, and a brief assessment of the significance and impact of the work.

- A. Academic advising.
- B. GTA advising or mentoring.
- C. Peer advising.

- D. Advising to student organizations.
- E. Other: Additional evidence of advising and mentoring may be added at the candidate's discretion as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit.

X. Administration and Service Related to the Instructional Mission

For each of the items included, provide dates and a brief context to indicate the significance and impact of the work.

- A. Management of departmental instructional center or program.
- B. Committee service contributions.
- C. Contributions to professional conferences.
- D. Contributions to diversity initiatives.
- E. Contributions to assessment initiatives.
- F. Contributions to outreach initiatives.
- G. Contributions to special events or programs (e.g. conferences, department celebrations, commencement).
- H. Other: Additional evidence of service related to instruction may be added as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit.

XI. Recognized Scholarly or Creative Work Enhancing Instruction

Candidates should list only those publications, projects, or performances that have appeared or been accepted for publication or presentation. They should *not* include work currently submitted and being reviewed or work in progress. (Work currently submitted and being reviewed or work in progress may be noted in section XII.)

For each publication, project, or performance, please indicate the lead author's or performer's name(s) in bold text, for example:

**Gardner, Thomas.** Regions of Unlikeness: Explaining Contemporary Poetry. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Papers, publications, or performances in collaboration with current or former students should include an asterisk at each student's name.

If research and creative scholarship are included in the promotion dossier, the following categories should be used:

- A. Awards, prizes, and recognition for research.
- B. List of contributions—identified by type and presented in a standard appropriate bibliographic form. Cite page numbers. Indicate lead author, per the example given above.
  - 1. Books or monographs, authored or edited.
  - 2. Book chapters.
  - 3. Textbooks authored or edited, including online textbooks.
  - 4. Online teaching materials available beyond the instructor's own courses.
  - 5. Papers in refereed journals (both print and electronic).
  - 6. Papers in refereed conference proceedings.

7. Creative scholarship.
8. Performances, exhibitions, compositions.
9. Other papers and reports, including publications, reviews, prefaces, introductions, catalog statements, translations, and abstracts.
10. Papers presented at professional meetings.
11. Readings of creative scholarship.
12. Other.

C. Sponsored research and other grant awards

- Explicitly cite the principal investigator(s)—all names that appear on the grant proposal, year, and duration of the award, percentage of candidate's participation, source (agency) of the award, and the amount.
- Indicate the percentage of candidate's participation.
- Do not include unfunded grant applications or proposals.

The department head's letter may address the issue of grant proposals submitted but not funded if this is deemed an important reflection of effort, for example.

D. Other: Candidates may include other evidence of research or creative scholarship enhancing teaching as long as sections V. – XII. do not exceed the 10-page limit.

XII. Work Under Review or In Progress

- A. Work submitted and under review.
- B. Work in progress.