

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS, EVALUATIONS, AND  
PROMOTIONS**

at the rank of

**LECTURER, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION, PROFESSOR OF  
INSTRUCTION, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE, OR PROFESSOR OF  
PRACTICE**

in

**THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING  
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA**

**April 24, 2017**

**Revised May 6, 2019**

**Revised May 14, 2020**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AT OR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIC ACADEMIC RANKS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A. LECTURER .....	4
B. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION .....	4
C. PROFESSOR OF INSTRUCTION .....	5
D. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE .....	5
E. PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE .....	6
<b>III. ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
A. EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....	7
B. EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY AND SERVICE .....	8
C. SUMMARY .....	9
<b>IV. REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES</b> .....	<b>10</b>
A. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS BY THE DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE OFFICER .....	10
B. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN PEER EVALUATION FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS .....	11
C. PROCEDURES FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS .....	11
D. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENTS .....	13
E. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION .....	14
F. COLLEGIATE PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY .....	17
G. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS .....	18

## I. INTRODUCTION

The College of Engineering recognizes that instructional faculty (Lecturers, Associate Professors of Instruction, Professors of Instruction, Associate Professors of Practice, and Professors of Practice) play an important role in advancing the teaching excellence of the College of Engineering. Instructional faculty focus on the teaching mission to provide departments with critical support and expertise to ensure the success of that mission. Examples may include: expert teaching in an important subject area that does not align with a research thrust; specialized skills and knowledge that don't currently exist in the department; high quality teaching of core departmental courses; performance of important tasks related to accreditation, projects labs, laboratory course support, outreach, extracurricular activities, etc. In addition, some instructional faculty members may be at the forefront of the development of innovative teaching methods, while others may enhance the educational opportunities offered to our students due to the specialized experiences or knowledge that they have gained in a prior engineering career. The College of Engineering justification for hiring instructional faculty is twofold: 1) teaching demand may exceed the capability of tenure-track faculty to fulfill certain elements of the teaching mission as described above; and 2) opportunities may exist to recruit people with unique capabilities to contribute to the teaching mission as described above that are not interested in a tenure-track faculty position. To optimize the positive impact that instructional faculty can have on our undergraduate and graduate programs, the policies and guidelines for their recruitment and retention must be designed to attract the best available candidates, engage them in a vibrant community of teaching and learning, and support their development as valued professionals.

Instructional faculty participate in relevant matters of departmental and collegiate governance. Instructional faculty with a 50% FTE or greater UI appointment are eligible to serve on the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC) and are eligible to vote on all matters of curriculum at the departmental and collegiate levels. Instructional faculty may be consulted in reviews of other instructional faculty and, if requested by the Department Executive Officer may participate in reviews of tenured or tenure-track faculty members, but do not vote on the appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion of any tenured or tenure-track faculty member.

The total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional faculty appointed in the College of Engineering will not exceed twenty percent of the total salaried FTE faculty in the College.

The standard effort expectation for full-time instructional faculty is eight units per academic year as assigned by the Departmental Executive Officer (DEO). Teaching a course generally represents one unit. Instructional faculty workloads must be predominantly dedicated to teaching but other units may be associated with the performance of important service related to accreditation, outreach, extracurricular activities, student advising, and other activities as assigned by the DEO. Instructional faculty members may also be expected to engage in professional productivity. Professional productivity is, in general, creative work beyond teaching. The workload expectation for the Instructional Faculty member shall be clearly specified in the instructional faculty member's individual employment contract.

The College of Engineering adheres to the general criteria for appointment and promotion to all grades of academic rank as described by the UI Instructional Faculty Policy in the Operational Manual Section III. 10.11. All actions taken by the College regarding appointment, reappointment, promotion, non-reappointment, and termination of instructional faculty are subject to this policy. Further, the notification requirements and grievance procedures will be followed by the College.

This document provides further details on the criteria and procedures for instructional faculty appointments, evaluations, and promotions in the College of Engineering to the extent that they apply uniformly in all departments of the College. It uses the structure and language from the *Criteria and Procedures for Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions in the College of Engineering*. Individual departments may or may not provide more detailed standards or criteria consistent with this document, and these, together with the College and University documents, will constitute the full set of standards and methods applicable in any individual case.

## **II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AT OR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIC ACADEMIC RANKS**

The Operations Manual outlines the qualifications for appointment at and the conditions for promotion to the ranks of Lecturer, Associate Professor of Instruction/Practice, or Professor of Instruction/Practice. The College of Engineering specifies these qualifications further as:

### **A. Lecturer**

1. Promise of ability as a teacher.
2. Doctorate in engineering or related discipline.

Initial and subsequent appointments at the rank of Lecturer shall be for a minimum term of one year and will not exceed three years.

### **B. Associate Professor of Instruction**

1. Doctorate in engineering or related discipline.
2. Convincing evidence of excellence in teaching
3. Clear potential to enhance the teaching mission of the department through contributions such as: curricular advances; innovative teaching methods; development of collaborative educational opportunities across the University; creation of new extracurricular learning opportunities, etc.
4. Professional, departmental, collegiate, or University service at an appropriate level.

Initial (probationary) appointment at the rank of Associate Professor of Instruction shall be for a term of one to three years. If the faculty member has previously served a term at the rank of Lecturer, this paragraph shall not apply.

Subsequent appointments at the rank of Associate Professor of Instruction (or the initial appointment, if the faculty member was promoted from the rank of Lecturer) shall be for a term of three to five years.

**C. Professor of Instruction**

1. Doctorate in engineering or related discipline.
2. Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels.
3. A clear record of enhancing the teaching mission of the department through contributions such as: curricular advances; innovative teaching methods; development of collaborative educational opportunities across the University; creation of new extracurricular learning opportunities, etc.
4. Record of significant and effective service to the profession, department, college, or the University.

Initial (probationary) appointment at the rank of Professor of Instruction shall be for a term of one to three years. If the faculty member has previously served a term at the rank of Lecturer or Associate Professor of Instruction or equivalent, this paragraph shall not apply.

Subsequent appointments at the rank of Professor of Instruction (or the initial appointment, if the faculty member was promoted from the rank of Lecturer or Associate Professor of Instruction) shall be for a term of three to five years.

**D. Associate Professor of Practice**

1. Substantial professional experience indicative of expertise and teaching ability within the designated area(s) of instruction.
2. Convincing evidence of excellence in teaching.
3. Clear potential to enhance the teaching mission of the department through contributions such as: curricular advances; innovative teaching methods; development of collaborative educational opportunities across the University; creation of new extracurricular learning opportunities; etc.
4. Professional, departmental, collegiate, or University service at an appropriate level.

Initial (probationary) appointment at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice shall be for a term of one to three years.

Subsequent appointments at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice shall be for a term of three to five years.

**E. Professor of Practice**

1. Substantial professional experience indicative of expertise and teaching ability within the designated area(s) of instruction.
2. A clear record of enhancing the teaching mission of the department through contributions such as: curricular advances; innovative teaching methods; development of collaborative educational opportunities across the University; creation of new extracurricular learning opportunities; etc.
3. Record of significant and effective service to the profession, department, college, or the University.

Initial (probationary) appointment at the rank of Professor of Practice shall be for a term of one to three years. If the faculty member has previously served a term at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice or equivalent, this paragraph shall not apply.

Subsequent appointments at the rank of Professor of Practice (or the initial appointment, if the faculty member was promoted from the rank of Associate Professor of Practice) shall be for a term of three to five years.

All instructional faculty appointments shall terminate at the end of the contract period, but reappointment is possible at the discretion of the College of Engineering. Decisions not to renew, not to promote, or to terminate instructional faculty may only occur as described in the University Operations Manual III-10.11g.

**III. ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY EVALUATIONS**

Evaluations of the performance of instructional faculty members are of two types.

1. Annual evaluations by the Department Executive Officer of all faculty performed for the purpose of recommending salary increments, assigning departmental teaching and service responsibilities, and allocating departmental teaching and service support.
2. Peer evaluations by the Departmental Consulting Group for making recommendations for reappointment and promotion of instructional faculty members.

All evaluations of faculty performance will be based on documented evidence of faculty contributions in the areas of teaching, and if relevant, service or professional productivity. Contributions in teaching will be the major factor in determining the outcome of each evaluation;

service, although important, will not carry the same weight. The University of Iowa Academic and Professional Record (APR) contains appropriate sections in which contributions in these areas are recorded in detail. Faculty may submit the older College of Engineering Faculty Activity Summary (FAS) or acceptable curriculum vitae in place of APR, and references to APR in the remainder of the policy can be read as “APR or equivalent information in the form of the College of Engineering FAS or acceptable curriculum vitae.” The specific elements of evaluation of these contributions are as follows.

#### **A. Evaluation of Teaching**

The first step in any consideration of faculty performance is an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Only after an affirmative judgment as to teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration be given to an evaluation of professional productivity or service.

Instructional Faculty in the College are generally expected to teach courses at a variety of academic levels. The teaching expectations for each individual instructional faculty member are defined in their individual employment contract. The evaluation of teaching will focus on the expectations so defined. The most important element in the peer evaluation of teaching is the determination of the contributions made by the faculty member in the development and maintenance of contemporary high-quality curricula at the undergraduate and the graduate levels in the light of established collegiate and departmental goals. Evidence for this should be drawn from the various items in the APR and evaluated. The following are the essential aspects of such an evaluation.

1. Evaluation of the objectives and contents of, and methods and policies in, courses taught by the faculty member with regard to the currency of content, depth of coverage, treatment of topics assumed for subsequent courses, selection of textbook and teaching material, and preparation of teaching aids.
2. Evaluation of contributions to curriculum development, which may include:
  - a) introduction of new courses,
  - a) introduction of innovative teaching methods,
  - b) seminars on modern topics for the benefit of students and faculty,
  - c) development of teaching laboratories,
  - d) introduction of computer technology in courses,
  - e) participation in teaching-related committees,
  - f) participation in other aspects of curriculum development,
  - g) cooperation with other instructors of multisection and related courses, and

h) other (e.g., development of new course materials, new laboratory experiments, substantial course revision, coordination of courses).

3. Evaluation of student inputs received through the mandatory Assessing the Classroom Environment (ACE) forms and additional student input solicited by the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) or DEO as part of the regular review process with regard to the classroom performance of the faculty member. Since departmental normative data are often sparse and thus of questionable reliability, analysis of ACE information should include a comparison to normative College-wide ACE data.

4. Evaluation of published class notes, textbooks and other educational material, and of teaching-related awards.

5. Observation by peers of classroom teaching. At minimum, three sessions must be observed as part of the peer evaluation of teaching for every reappointment or promotion review. At least two observers, who will be faculty qualified to be members of the candidate's DCG unless circumstances dictate otherwise, will participate in the visits. The DEO, after consulting with the candidate, shall arrange for selection of the observers. Classroom visits need not take place during the semester in which the review is conducted but may take place during the preceding four academic-year semesters. Visits will be scheduled with appropriate advance notice and in consultation with the candidate. Unless prohibited by written department policy, video observation may, with the candidate's consent, be substituted for direct observation of classroom teaching. Unless departmental policy specifies a particular method of recording observations, individual observers may use their own discretion in recording their findings. The conclusions of the observers shall be incorporated into the peer evaluation of teaching report, a copy of which is provided to the candidate. If provided for by department policy, observers may individually or jointly draft a separate report which is shared with the candidate. Although classroom observations are a required part of the peer evaluation of teaching, it is desirable that the observations also serve to help the candidate improve his or her teaching.

6. Evaluation of contributions to undergraduate advising as assigned by the DEO.

The evaluation of teaching will be consistent with the faculty member's workload allocation as specified in his/her individual employment contract.

## **B. Evaluation of Professional Productivity and Service**

In addition to teaching contributions, instructional faculty members may be expected to provide professional productivity or service at various levels within and outside the department. It is very difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to place a higher value on one type of professional productivity or service activity than on another. However, factors that are paramount in the evaluation of overall professional productivity or service contributions are (a) successful discharge of departmental and collegiate responsibilities, (b) growth in the scope of professional productivity or



service with advancement in ranks of instructional faculty, and (c) contribution to the enhancement of the reputation of the department and the University regarding teaching and learning. The types of activities to be considered in the evaluation of professional productivity and service involve the following:

1. Department, College, and University. Carrying out committee responsibilities in a thorough and timely manner is essential for a favorable evaluation. Other activities may include advising students and student organizations, providing peer support for the teaching mission, and, for more experienced faculty members, taking a leadership role in curriculum review and development, and in securing external support for advancement of teaching and learning and the academic programs of the department.
2. Professional and Scholarly Organizations. Important forms of service in this category may include: membership on committees that address engineering education; organization of conferences or sessions at conferences that address engineering education; presentation of short courses; membership on accreditation boards or agencies; and other activities closely related to teaching and learning.
3. Government Agencies and Community Groups. These include membership on state and national boards, and professional advising of government organizations in the solution of engineering problems and in the formulation of public policy related to engineering education.
4. Professional Productivity. This may include, e.g., authoring textbooks or other instructional material; development and dissemination of course laboratories or other curriculum enhancements; or development, investigation, and dissemination of pedagogical findings on novel teaching methods or techniques.

The evaluation of professional productivity and service activities will be consistent with the faculty member's individual employment contract.

### **C. Summary**

In identifying the important elements in the evaluation of faculty performance, no attempt has been made to distinguish between criteria applicable to different academic ranks. The same general types of activities are normally pursued by all instructional faculty. The evaluations are, however, to be based on the differences in qualifications and conditions noted in Section II of this document.

#### **IV. REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

##### **A. Annual Evaluations by the Department Executive Officer**

1. Annual evaluations shall be made of all instructional faculty members.
2. The evaluations shall be based on the latest APR, ACE survey data, and any additional material the faculty member believes is appropriate. Deadlines for updating the APR and submitting additional material shall be established by the DEO.
3. The DEO will carefully review the available material according to the expected standard of performance for the instructional faculty members in their unit based on the individual faculty member's workload allocation and then schedule an individual conference with each faculty member to discuss the DEO's evaluation of the material. Such conferences shall take place before making any final recommendations for salary increments or reallocation of departmental resources for the coming year. In addition, the DEO may utilize inputs from students and other faculty members (and other DEOs for persons on joint appointments) who may have special knowledge of the contributions of the faculty member.
4. When, as a result of an annual review, the DEO concludes that there are significant deficiencies related to teaching or service, the DEO shall provide written notifications of these conclusions to the faculty member being reviewed, and the faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond in writing. The final report and the faculty member's response will be sent to the Dean and will be kept with the faculty member's personnel records.

**B. Faculty Participation in Peer Evaluation for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Recommendations**

1. The composition of the DCG participating in the review and evaluation process will vary depending upon the status of the person being considered and the purpose of the review, and will be limited to faculty members who attend the meeting or meetings where the appropriate matter is discussed and resolved. Membership of the review committee shall be as follows. In all cases, the faculty involved must hold primary appointment in the same department as the instructional faculty under consideration.

<b>Matter under Consideration</b>	<b>Membership of the DCG</b>
New appointments of Instructional Faculty at all ranks	All instructional faculty, tenured faculty and probationary faculty.
Reappointment of Lecturers	All tenured, tenure-track, and instructional faculty.
Reappointment of Associate Professors of Instruction/Practice	All tenured faculty, all tenure-track Associate and Full Professors, and all Associate and Full Professors of Instruction/Practice.
Reappointment of Professors of Instruction/Practice	All tenured faculty, all tenure-track Full Professors, and all Full Professors of Instruction/Practice.
Promotion from Lecturer to Associate Professor of Instruction/Practice	All tenured faculty, all tenure-track Associate and Full Professors, and all Associate and Full Professors of Instruction/Practice.
Promotion from Associate Professor of Instruction to Professor of Instruction/Practice	All tenured faculty, all tenure-track Full Professors, and all Full Professors of Instruction/Practice.

**C. Procedures for New Appointments**

1. Any appointment to an instructional faculty position of a person not then holding such a position in the College of Engineering shall be deemed a new appointment. In case the appointment involves individuals who already hold a faculty appointment in another College of the University, all the procedures in this section will apply except for those in items 3 (b-e).
2. When an instructional faculty position is to be filled, the Department Executive Officer shall appoint and designate the chair of a Search Committee consisting of at

least three faculty members holding primary appointments in the department. If advantageous, a faculty member holding secondary appointment in the department, or external to the department, may be added to the committee. Alternatively, the entire departmental faculty may be designated as the Search Committee.

3. It shall be the duty of the Search Committee to
  - a) Ensure, in consultation with the DEO, that all affirmative action procedures are followed in the search;
  - b) Describe the position in a form suitable for advertisement;
  - c) Send notification of the vacancy to appropriate institutions, associations, publications, and individuals;
  - d) Screen applications;
  - e) Consult with the DEO and the review committee to identify candidates to be invited for interview;
  - f) Prepare a dossier for review by the DCG on each candidate to be invited;
  - g) Prepare a schedule for each candidate's visit to include conferences with individual faculty, the DEO, the Dean, and other appropriate persons, and an optional seminar presented by the candidate to the faculty and students.
4. A meeting or meetings of the review committee shall be convened by the DEO or the Search Committee Chair to discuss the qualifications of the candidates, to obtain a closed ballot vote at the meeting to select the candidate for the position, and to make contingency plans in the event that (1) the selected candidate rejects the offer, or (2) the DEO and/or the Dean do not concur in the review committee recommendation.
5. After taking into account the vote of the review committee and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in the review committee meetings, the DEO shall transmit his/her own independent recommendation to the Dean along with the results of the review committee vote, and make an offer to the candidate upon receiving concurrence from the Dean.
6. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the review committee, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the review committee shall be made at the time the DEO's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the review committee, the Dean shall report this fact

to the DEO and to the members of the review committee together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DEO and to the members of the review committee shall be made at the time the Dean's recommendation is made.

#### **D. Procedures for Reappointments**

1. Evaluations for reappointment are required for all instructional faculty in the department, whose performance, if judged to be satisfactory, would normally lead to reappointment at the current rank.
2. Such evaluations shall be undertaken and completed by a date designated by the DEO during the terminal year of an appointment or in the year prior to the terminal year of the appointment if warranted by the previous Annual Review.
3. It shall be the responsibility of the DEO to
  - a) Establish a timetable for the conduct of the review;
  - b) Arrange for the development of a file for each person being considered for a reappointment with each such person given the opportunity to submit whatever he/she considers relevant to the established criteria;
  - c) Convene the DCG and appoint a chairperson to conduct the meeting or meetings at which the group considers what action to recommend concerning reappointment;
  - d) Transmit, after taking into account the recommendations of the review committee and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the file and the meeting, her or his own independent recommendation to the Dean and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the review committee and the results of the consultations with those named above.
4. The DCG may appoint individual faculty or subcommittees to collect all pertinent information on each candidate and shall meet as often as necessary to review and evaluate the faculty member's teaching and service contributions. The faculty member being reviewed may be interviewed by the group, and may wish to request such an interview and/or the opportunity to present a departmental seminar describing past, present, and planned teaching and service activities.
5. A closed ballot vote of the DCG attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting. A written report of the DCG's activities and evaluation shall be drafted by the group chairperson, modified as necessary and approved by the group, and submitted by the group chairperson to the DEO. Minority reports, if applicable, shall be appended to and submitted as part of the written report.

6. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DCG shall be made at the time the DEO's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the Dean shall report this fact to the DEO and to the members of the DCG with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DEO and to the members of the DCG shall be made in writing.
8. At each level of the review and recommendation process and at the time that such information is available, the DEO shall inform the candidate of the recommendation being forwarded to the next level. Following the complete review and recommendation process, the DEO shall meet with each candidate not recommended for reappointment to review the recommendations of the review committee, the DEO, and the Dean, and to inform the candidate of the grievance procedures available should the candidate wish to contest the final decision.

#### **E. Procedures for Promotion**

1. University of Iowa policy shall apply to all departmental peer reviews leading to recommendations concerning promotions. Departmental and Collegiate procedures employed in such reviews shall be consistent with the Office of the Provost's Procedures for Instructional-track Promotion Decision Making.  
[https://provost.uiowa.edu/sites/provost.uiowa.edu/files/IF\\_Promotion%20procedure\\_final\\_4-12-16.pdf](https://provost.uiowa.edu/sites/provost.uiowa.edu/files/IF_Promotion%20procedure_final_4-12-16.pdf).

An instructional faculty member shall initiate a review with a written request to the DEO in accordance with the University Operations Manual III-10.11f.

2. It shall be the duty of the DEO:
  - a) To establish a timetable for the conduct of the review (see item 9).
  - b) To arrange for the development of a promotion file for each person being considered for promotion, with each person given the opportunity to submit whatever he/she considers relevant to the established criteria. Materials which could not have been available at the time of preparation of this file may be added at a later date by the candidate through the DEO. Where the availability of this material prior to the completion of the deliberations of the review committee can be anticipated, the expected additions should be identified at the time the file is submitted, and the new material should be added to the file as it becomes available.
  - c) To obtain reviews of the candidate's teaching. After consultation with the

DCG, the DEO will obtain 8-10 evaluation letters from a sample of students who have taken the candidate's courses; evaluation letters from other faculty members closely involved with the candidate's teaching through team teaching, course coordination, etc. as appropriate based on the faculty member's employment agreement. The DEO shall take particular care to keep the identity of reviewers confidential. The portion of the candidate's work that each reviewer is to evaluate shall be determined by the DEO in consultation with the DCG with the aim of obtaining a comprehensive assessment of the quality and scope of the candidate's teaching contributions. The process of selecting reviewers will commence on or before September 1.

- d) To convene the DCG to review all eligible faculty and identify the candidates to be considered for promotion and to appoint the chairperson of the review committee.
  - e) The DEO shall send to the candidate a copy of the internal peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching and service. The candidate will have a total of five working days to submit corrections to statements of fact in these evaluations.
  - f) After taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the promotion file and/or the meeting of the review committee when the final recommendation was made, to transmit an independent recommendation to the Dean together with the promotion record (including appendices), and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the review committee and the results of consultations with those named above.
  - g) The DEO is responsible for those functions assigned to the DEO in the University of Iowa Operations Manual except when they are assigned to others by College policy. The DEO's designee may assist the DEO in performing those functions related to communicating with external reviewers or with members of the DCG regarding external reviewers as appropriate based on the faculty member's employment agreement. The DEO shall keep a record of comments about external reviewers submitted by the DEO's designee. The DEO will also keep a record of correspondence and other communications between the DEO's designee and external reviewers.
3. Although the DCG may appoint individual faculty members or subcommittees to collect all pertinent information on each candidate, peer evaluations of teaching and service will be conducted and entered into the promotion record by the DCG. The DCG shall meet as often as necessary to review and evaluate the faculty member's teaching, professional productivity, and service contributions. When appropriate, the DCG may solicit information and assessments of a candidate's teaching or service from knowledgeable individuals from within or outside of the University. The DCG may also solicit information and assessments of a candidate's teaching from knowledgeable individuals from within the University. The faculty member being reviewed may be interviewed by the group, and may wish to request such an

interview and/or the opportunity to present a departmental seminar describing past, present, and planned teaching and service activities. In accordance with University policy, the DCG's peer evaluation report on the candidate's professional productivity or service may analyze the relevant materials in the promotion record.

4. A closed ballot vote of the DCG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting. It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week's notice of this meeting, unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible. Absentee voting by members of the DCG via conference call is appropriate, but voting must be anonymous. To make the vote anonymous, the member missing will participate in the meeting by teleconference and leave two ballots, one yes, one no, each in an envelope inside another envelope. The appropriate vote will be made by having the person designate which envelop contains the official vote. A simple majority voting in favor of promotion will represent a positive recommendation by the DCG. A written report of the DCG's activities and evaluation shall be drafted by the group chairperson, modified as necessary and approved by the group, and submitted by the group chairperson to the DEO and candidate. The report provided to the candidate shall be redacted as necessary to protect the confidentiality of all individuals who directly or indirectly contributed to the report. Minority reports, if applicable, shall be appended to and submitted as part of the written report. As provided for by University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response and additional information.
5. If the recommendation of the DEO differs from the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the DEO shall report this fact to them and to the Dean together with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the review committee shall be made in writing at the time the Department Executive Officer's recommendation is submitted to the Dean.
6. Any new material that becomes available after the submission of the DEO's recommendation to the Dean, that could not have been available earlier, and which, in the opinion of the DEO, may have a substantive impact on the Dean's evaluation, should be forwarded to the Dean. If, in the Dean's judgment, this material erodes the basis of the DCG or DEO's recommendation, the Dean should return the case to the department for further consideration.
7. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the judgment of the DEO and/or the judgment of a majority of the DCG, the Dean shall report this fact to the DEO and to the members of the DCG with the reason or reasons for the recommendation made. The report to the DEO and to the members of the review committee shall be made in writing.



8. At the same time that the promotion file is submitted to the Dean, the DEO will provide the candidate with a copy of the DEO's recommendation. As provided for by University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response and additional information.
9. Following the complete review and recommendation process, the DEO shall meet with each candidate not recommended for promotion to review the recommendations of the DCG, the DEO, and the Dean, to provide suggestions for improving any apparent deficiencies.
10. The normal timetable recommended for promotion evaluation is as follows.
 

August 15	Candidate submits request for review to DEO
September 1	Candidate submits promotion dossier.
December 1	DCG's recommendations submitted to DEO
December 15	DEO's recommendations submitted to Dean
February 15	Dean's Recommendation submitted to Provost

#### **F. Collegiate Procedures for Promotion of Instructional Faculty**

1. In formulating a recommendation in promotion cases for instructional faculty, the Dean shall seek the formal advice of the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee. The advisory committee provides the Dean a way to obtain help in interpreting the materials in the promotion record and in fully understanding a candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
2. Both the Dean and the advisory committee shall act so as to avoid creating another full layer in the promotion process that diminishes the importance of faculty judgments at the department level. The Dean shall remain fully responsible for instructional faculty promotion decisions made at the College level.
3. Following consultation with the Engineering Faculty Council, during a regularly scheduled meeting of the Council, the Dean will annually appoint not less than five faculty members to the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee with no more than two members being from the same department. Committee members must be full professors (instructional or tenure-track) with primary appointments in the College. Except when circumstances warrant, the Dean shall strive to achieve broad departmental representation on the committee and shall appoint the committee as soon in the fall semester as is feasible.
4. A member of the advisory committee, appointed by the Dean, will serve as chairperson and shall ensure that the advisory committee discharges its responsibilities in a timely fashion and in a manner consistent within College and University policy. Following appointment of the advisory committee, the Dean shall notify the faculty of the committee's membership and chairperson.

5. The Dean may attend the meetings of the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee but may not vote or contribute to the committee's report.
6. Members of the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Committee who are members of the departmental DCG for a particular candidate may not participate in the advisory committee's deliberations or voting in regard to that candidate.
7. The Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee shall meet to discuss the qualifications of each candidate for promotion and to vote by closed ballot to advise for or against the granting of promotion. A simple majority advising promotion represents a positive recommendation. The results of the balloting will be announced at the same meeting. The Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee shall supervise the drafting of a report recording and explaining the committee's vote. The report need not be lengthy, but should explain the rationale for the vote. After securing committee approval of the report, the Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee shall communicate it to the Dean.
8. If the recommendation of either the DCG or Department Executive Officer is positive and the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Advisory Committee advises against promotion, the Committee's report will be provided to the candidate. Pursuant to University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response.
9. At the same time that the promotion file is submitted to the Provost, the Dean will provide the candidate with a copy of the recommendation and the report of the Dean's Advisory Instructional Faculty Promotion Committee. As provided for by University policy, the candidate will have five working days to access the promotion file and another five working days to submit a letter of response and additional information. At the time that the Provost's recommendation to the Board of Regents is available to the Dean, the Dean will inform the candidate and Department Executive Officer in writing of the Provost's recommendation. In the case of a recommendation against promotion, the Dean will inform the candidate of the availability and enclose a copy via certified mail of the official Instructional Faculty Dispute Procedures as defined in the University of Iowa Operations Manual, section III.10.11(h).

### **G. Other Considerations**

Given that promotion decisions within instructional faculty ranks do not carry the same "up or out" decision associated with tenure, a negative recommendation on a promotion request need not translate into termination of employment.

Instructional faculty members may apply for open positions on the tenure track, but they may be appointed to the tenure track only one time during their career at the University of Iowa. Similarly, tenure-track faculty may apply for open instructional faculty positions, but an instructional faculty appointment shall not be used as an automatic default for accomplished teachers who made an unsuccessful tenure bid.