

GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL OF NON- TENURE ACCRUING REGULAR FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Please note: Contracts must be renewed one year prior to the end of a non-tenure accruing full-time faculty member's contract. (For example, if a person's contract ends AY 2015-16, the contract should be reviewed and renewed AY 2014-15.)

This document outlines the procedure for reviewing full-time, regular active status faculty in non-tenure accruing positions for the purpose of determining whether to recommend the renewal of such appointments. This review, which supplements yearly evaluations and does not replace them, is designed:

1. To assess a faculty member's performance with respect to their appointment and to offer ways for improving performance;
2. To recommend or not recommend a faculty member's reappointment.

Departmental and CCAS academic, programmatic, and fiscal needs may be considered in determining whether to recommend the renewal of faculty appointments.

Department Chairs should communicate with the Dean's Office for **a list of faculty** up for contract renewal.

Qualified Department Faculty should **meet to discuss the faculty member(s) under review**. The discussion should include assessing strengths and weaknesses, offering suggestions for improvement, and providing mentoring opportunities related to scholarship, teaching, and service.

Contract Renewal Checklist: *everything in bold must be its own electronic subfolder*

- 1. Letter of Transmittal from Chair:** The letter should include a recommendation for renewal/non-renewal including the proposed length of term and percentages of effort, a summary of the department's discussion, and an overall evaluation of the faculty member. *If the department is recommending renewal of the appointment, a letter from the chair recommending the renewal to the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs should **also** be submitted through the Dean of Columbian College.*
- 2. Faculty Personal Statement:** A short (no more than 2 pages) statement of accomplishments and future goals from the faculty member should be provided. Depending on the faculty member's appointment, the statement might address:
 - Courses taught and planned for the next appointment period if appointed;
 - Teaching approaches and their effectiveness;
 - Administrative and service duties undertaken or expected and their contribution to the overall life of the university over the next appointment period professional activities (including research and scholarship) during the current period of appointment and the anticipated professional activities during the next appointment period.

3. Copy of Current Contract

4. Updated C.V.

5. Teaching: Relevant supporting materials (e.g., sample syllabi, assignments, copies of publications). Student and peer evaluations are *required*.

*****Student and peer evaluations should be sub-folders of the Teaching Folder*****

a. Student Evaluations: Student evaluations since last appointment review

b. Peer Evaluations: Peer reviews by faculty of the faculty member's teaching

6. Research

7. Service: List of departmental, school, and/or university service assignments since arriving at GW or since the last curriculum review (whichever is most recent), by semester/year.

*****Please Note: Letters of reference need not be solicited*****

THE REVIEW PROCESS:

Faculty members who are eligible to participate in and vote on a contract renewal will conduct the review. (Departmental by-laws should clearly specify who is qualified to participate and vote in this process). The review will involve a thorough examination of the faculty member's scholarship, student and peer evaluations of teaching, and service contributions. Participants in the process should discuss the strengths and weaknesses of faculty member under review and offer, when appropriate, suggestions with regard to improvements in scholarship, teaching, and service. Participants in the review should also discuss the mentoring process and, if relevant, offer concrete plans for improving the mentoring of the faculty member under review.

Because the review status has important appointment implications, the recommendation for renewal or non-renewal and for the length of any subsequent reappointment should be voted on at a meeting at which a quorum of departmental faculty who are eligible to vote exists. (To repeat a point from above: voting faculty should be clearly defined in the departmental by-laws).