

Arts and Sciences

Template for Teaching Faculty Personnel Policies, to be adopted verbatim by Departments and Programs where desired

I. Renewal of Teaching Faculty Contracts

Requests to renew Teaching Faculty (TF) on contracts that are three years or longer should be submitted to the Dean one year in advance of the expiry date on the current contract (i.e., for a contract of three years or longer ending May 2025, request to renew with the new contract starting August 2025 should be made by spring 2024). Requests for renewal are due at the same time as requests for new TTE and TF hires, usually in the spring.

Criteria for Renewal:

- 1) The renewal of TF positions requires demonstrating continuing institutional need for the position, with final approval by the Dean. To assist in assessing institutional need, the Dean's office will provide departments/programs with data on a TF member's historical student enrollments early in the spring semester of the penultimate year of the contract.
- 2) The renewal of a contract also requires TF to demonstrate satisfactory performance in a position. Routinely and consistently meeting expectations in merit evaluations, or successfully meeting benchmarks for improvement set during a mentorship program, is sufficient for renewal (see below).

Process for Renewal:

Chairs/Directors should submit a memo requesting, or recommending against, renewal to their Vice-Dean with the following:

- A holistic evaluation in narrative form of institutional need for the position that considers enrollment data and the faculty member's contributions to the breadth and depth of the unit's curriculum and/or to the A&S and COLL curricula
- Demonstration of a faculty member's satisfactory performance in the position based on merit evaluations during the contract period and/or the evaluation of syllabi, student evaluations, and course development and innovation.

If a TF member does not meet expectations during an annual merit review, and the time is insufficient to complete a formal mentorship program with benchmarks for improvement before a renewal decision is due, then when they are being considered for renewal, their performance will be evaluated holistically (e.g., evaluations, peer observations, syllabi) across the duration of service to William & Mary. This evaluation will be undertaken by the Chair/Director, or supervisor, and the A&S Dean's office. If possible, the renewal decision should consider teaching performance in the spring of calendar year following the merit evaluation that did not meet expectations.

The Dean, in consultation with the Vice, Associate and Assistant Deans, will make the final determination on renewal. If a TF member in a renewable position is notified that they will not be receiving a new contract, they may request that the Teaching Faculty Committee – or other body charged with this function – review the matter and consider opportunities for redeployment from the responsibilities of the previous contract to new duties. TF who receive a notice of nonrenewal may also follow *Faculty Handbook* procedures to grieve the nonrenewal.

II. Promotion of Teaching Faculty

Although the timing of promotion is at the discretion of TF in consultation with their Department Chair/Program Director, promotion is ordinarily considered at the second renewal request at rank, though in exceptional circumstances, it may be considered during the first renewal process. A person may stay in their rank as long as they choose, and normal processes for renewal will apply as long as they remain at that rank. Promotion dossiers for TF in renewable positions may be submitted when a position is due for renewal as part of the request for renewal, usually in the spring.

Criteria for Promotion:

No faculty member will be promoted without a history of excellent performance in the position. Excellent performance demonstrates a commitment to growth, development, and improvement. Given the culture of teaching excellence at W&M, “meeting expectations” in annual merit scores is evidence of excellence, and teaching evaluations will form part of the assessment of excellence. However, teaching evaluations should not be the sole metric. Other means of demonstrating excellent performance for promotion may include (but are not limited to) peer observations, participating in pedagogical workshops, developing innovative assignments, attending conferences, undertaking research to offer and bolster new courses, mentoring, and/or supervising student projects.

Excellence in service should include diversifying one’s service contributions and actively participating in the university community. Excellence does not require exceeding the required contractual percentages for service at rank.

Process for Promotion:

Early in the spring semester in which the review is to take place, candidates for promotion will prepare a dossier, which must include the following:

- a current C.V.
- a brief self-narrative (not more than 3 pages, 12-point font, single-spaced or the equivalent double-spaced). The narrative should focus on teaching and service (broadly defined to include department, university, and field). This may include a discussion of how teaching has developed and improved. Research does not fall within the contractual responsibilities of TF. However, in certain cases, research may be discussed for the ways that it enhances teaching and service.
- syllabi for all courses a TF member has taught at their current rank

- course evaluations for all courses a TF member has taught at their current rank
- other evidence of excellence in teaching, as desired (see above)

Candidates for promotion will submit their dossiers to the [unit personnel committee] by the first week of February. The [unit personnel committee] will review the materials in the dossier and write a report that evaluates the candidate's teaching and service, and recommends either for or against promotion. The report and the candidate's entire dossier will then be made available to the department's/program's tenured faculty and TF above rank who will meet to vote on the recommendation and to suggest changes to the report. After the vote, the final version of the report, the chair's/director's assessment of institutional need for the position (also submitted as part of the renewal request), and a chair's/director's report on the vote, will be added to the dossier and shared with the candidate. The candidate must have a full calendar week to respond to the committee report and the chair's/director's letter before the dossier is submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences. The response should be included in the dossier.

III. Merit Procedures for Teaching Faculty

TF, including visiting teaching professors and adjunct lecturers, will be evaluated annually at the same time as tenured and tenure-eligible faculty.

Adjunct lecturers and TF will be evaluated for teaching on a scale of 0-6 using the same criteria and materials as those used for TTE faculty in each unit.

TF with contractual responsibilities for service will be evaluated for service on a scale of 0-3. Appropriate weight should be given to the contractual service obligations of each rank. Thus, service warranting a score of 3/3 for an Assistant Teaching Professor will be about four times less than the amount of service expected for a Full Teaching Professor to score 3/3.

Units should take into consideration the more limited opportunities available to TF relative to TTE faculty when evaluating the quantity of service for merit evaluation. For examples of service for TF, please see the Teaching Faculty Framework. A substantial proportion of the service activity should be at W&M.

The Department Chair/Program Director will report the score for each TF member AND whether they meet or do not meet the expectations of their role within the department/program. Meeting expectations within [unit] entails fulfilling contractual responsibilities for teaching and service, as well as:

- a) Receiving a merit score that is not significantly below the department's/program's average combined score of teaching and service
- or-
- b) Demonstrating a commitment to excellent teaching as shown in teaching evaluations and such additional evidence as peer observations, participating in pedagogical workshops, developing innovative assignments, attending conferences, undertaking

research to offer and bolster new courses, mentoring, and/or supervising student projects.

Not meeting expectations entails not meeting contractual requirements for teaching and service, or

- a) Receiving a merit score that falls significantly below the department's/program's average
- or-
- b) Consistently receiving teaching evaluations and other forms of assessment that identify specific areas of concern, such as, for example, in course preparation or classroom performance

Spreadsheets will be provided to departments for entry of merit scores and submission to the Dean's office, and they will be pre-programmed to calculate a weighted score for each TF member. The score out of a total of 9 will be appropriately scaled to a revised score out of 9 that reflects contractual expectations by percentage effort (i.e., 95% teaching/5% service for Assistant Teaching Professors, 90% teaching/10% service for Associate Teaching Professors, and 80% teaching/20% service for Teaching Professors). The Dean's office will use the weighted score in merit calculations.

The Chair/Program Director will share average scores in the categories of teaching and service for all faculty (TTE and TF combined) with the department or program faculty.

In the spirit of mentoring TF (especially those on their first contract), the Chairs/ Program Director should examine TF teaching evaluations at the conclusion of each semester. If teaching scores are significantly lower than the mean for the unit, the Chair/Director and/or the faculty member's mentor will work informally with the faculty member to support them in improving their performance, including by referring to other units on campus, for example the Studio for Teaching & Learning Innovation.

If a TF member does not meet expectations during an annual merit review, then a formal mentorship program with measurable benchmarks for improvement will be initiated and completed during the next academic year. The mentorship program will be created collaboratively between the TF member; their Chair/ Director, or supervisor; and the A&S Dean's office. If mentorship is needed, TF may also consult with the Chair of the Teaching Faculty Committee to discuss performance evaluations and devise strategies for improvement.

Progress towards meeting benchmarks will be assessed by the Chair/Director and the A&S Dean's office at the conclusion of the mentorship program. If benchmarks have not been met, the contract will not be renewed. The final decision on whether or not benchmarks have been met rests with the Dean.

Approved PPC 6-3-24