

Guide to Preparing for your Professor Review

Introduction

The instructions below assume that you are familiar with the [DRBU Professor Plan of Employment](#) and DRBU policy regarding the schedule of academic reviews and appointments. A review file is prepared when an appointee is due to be considered for one or more of the following:

- non-permanent reappointment,
- special one-year appointment for part-time professor, or
- permanent appointment.

Timeline for review process

The standard deadlines are listed below.

Notification of upcoming review.	Appointee to be reviewed will be notified by the OAA in July of the last year of the appointee's current term.
Appointee submits review portfolio.	Two weeks before scheduled interview.
Interview with review panel.	Scheduled during fall semester.
Notification of appointment for the following academic year.	December 15 or two weeks after interview, whichever comes later.
Deadline for candidate to request reconsideration of a negative decision.	February 1 or four weeks after notification, whichever comes later.

Due to the number of professors due to be reviewed in 2017, we will be stretching out the timeline into the spring 2018 semester. Professors will be scheduled for their review based on number of years of service at DRBU.

Review Panel

All full-time and part-time non-permanent professors will be reviewed by the following panel:

- Dr. Sue Rounds, Professor and President
- Dr. Martin Verhoeven, Professor and Dean of Academics
- Doug Powers, Professor and Vice President for Finance and Administration

File Submission Procedure

All evidence will be submitted to Dr. Sue Rounds for inclusion in the review portfolio. Dr. Rounds will likely seek administrative help to organize the files and circulate them to the review panel. All files will be kept confidential.

Preparing a Review Portfolio

Reviews will be based on the five criteria outlined in the [DRBU Professor Plan of Employment](#). The following guidelines applies to the 2017-2018 review and may be modified before future review cycles. All professors under review will be notified such modifications before their review cycle. A template and checklist will be provided to help a professor organize the submission of their review materials. Examples and/or guidelines will also be provided to help professors compose documents such as their teaching statement and self-assessment.

The review panel will solicit feedback from two of a professor's co-instructors on criterion three and criterion five. The panel will also solicit from members of faculty and staff feedback for a professor on criterion five. These peer feedback will be submitted in a written form using a template provided by the review panel. After reviewing the feedback from different sources, the review panel will compose an anonymized summary and discard the individual submissions to protect confidentiality. The anonymized summary will be part of a professor's personnel file. The Faculty Review Committee advises the review panel to interview the author of a strong feedback before incorporating it in the anonymized summary.

The following documents may be requested as evidence for the review:

1. Current Academic Employment History (C.V.). Data may be requested from the OAA. Your C.V. may include some or all of the following:
 - a. List of education, training, and work experience
 - b. list of courses you've taught (and names of co-teachers if applicable).
 - c. list of curricular, professional/co-curricular development (courses audited, curriculum prepared, etc.)
 - d. list of scholarly activities (conferences, papers, publications, articles, websites)
 - e. list of DRBU service performed (committees, etc.)
 - f. list of honors and awards.
2. Evidence in support of the five criteria outlined in the DRBU Professor Plan of Employment. This will likely take the form of a self-narrative and may include additional supplementary documents. See below under each criteria for suggested forms of evidence.
 - a. **Criteria 1:** Excellence in intellect and imagination.
 - i. This criterion is meant to be used positively, not negatively; that is, like a "cherry" on top of a sundae. Lack of evidence in a professor's portfolio to support this criterion should not negatively prejudice the review.
 - b. **Criteria 2:** Serious engagement and commitment to DRBU's programs, as demonstrated by continued learning in the areas they encompass, an increasing awareness and

understanding of the deep questions the programs raise, and meaningful contribution to the learning of colleagues and students in the classroom and beyond.

- i. Examples of evidence in these three areas include:
 1. Leadership or participation in faculty, staff, and student study groups pertinent to the programs
 2. Curriculum development consistent with DRBU's mission and model
 - a. Participation in program design and development
 - b. Strand and course development and revision
 - c. Creation of new or significantly revised syllabi
 - d. Preparation of course materials.
 3. Leadership or participation in recruiting
 4. Leadership or participation in university development
 5. Leadership or participation in campus life programs and activities
 6. Leadership or participation in co-curricular programs and activities
 7. Leadership or participation in outcome assessment or program review activities
 8. Creating promotional materials for DRBU
 9. Scholarship activities on the nature and benefits of DRBU's model and programs
 - a. Writing, presenting, and publishing articles, essays, and papers
 - b. Organizing and attending workshops and conferences
 - c. Texts translation projects.
- c. **Criteria 3:** Competence in leading small, seminar-style classes, demonstrated in part by modeling skills and methods for learning, close listening, and being a resourceful guide to student inquiry.
 - i. Examples of evidence for this criterion include:
 1. Self-assessment
 2. Teaching statement
 3. Written feedback from two co-instructors
 4. Optional considerations for student evaluations
 5. Optional classroom observation from the review panel; mandatory for first review and permanent review
- d. **Criteria 4:** Willingness and ability to teach in all parts of DRBU's programs.
 - i. A professor is required, as a rule of thumb, to teach 16 different courses in the MA and the BA curricula prior to receiving permanent appointment.
 1. Given that adjustments to the BA program are still being made, specifying what these 16 courses should be is premature at this point. This criterion will become practicable when DRBU matriculates multiple MA and BA cohorts per year.
 2. For the 2017 review cycle, the panel will emphasize its assessment of willingness rather than ability.
- e. **Criteria 5:** Responsiveness to the needs of DRBU's community, as a civil and collegial member.

- i. The following statement will guide considerations on collegiality: “The Professor exhibits the ability to build and maintain civic relationships.”
- ii. Examples of evidence in the two parts of this criterion include:
 1. Responsiveness to the needs of DRBU’s community
 - a. Membership on committees
 - b. Carrying out administrative duties
 - c. Informal and formal student advising (academic or otherwise)
 - d. Participation in student activities.
 2. “Responsiveness” can be evidenced by a list of services, accompanied by a narrative from the professor under review.
 3. Possible tools for gathering evidence:
 - a. Written feedback from two co-instructors
 - b. Written feedback from other members of the community.