

AddRan College of Liberal Arts
Professional Development Review Policy and Procedures

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of a Professional Development Review (PDR) is to promote excellence in all areas of a faculty member's professional life, particularly in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, advising, and professional development, in a manner consistent with TCU's overall mission. Rather than create a system to impose penalties or sanctions, the PDR institutionalizes an opportunity for faculty members to make visible their efforts to plan for continued development.

This document outlines the process and criteria for PDRs and is consistent with TCU's *Faculty and Staff Handbook* (see specifically **Part III of the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Policy**). Each procedure refers by number to the adopted University policy as stated in the Faculty & Staff Handbook. AddRan College departments are encouraged to customize their own PDR policies and procedures and to specify which PDR items are to be submitted for review, subject to the general guidelines specified below. The following procedures also address the Provost's request that each department develop at least one additional systematic method for evaluating teaching (other than eSPOTs).

Regardless of their rank or years in service, all post-tenure faculty and instructors are encouraged to be productive, engaged citizens of the academic community. Recognizing the need to grow, experiment, and renew, the PDR allows instructors and tenured faculty members to contribute to the health of the University in a variety of ways, and diverse profiles of productivity/citizenship are encouraged.

PDR POLICY AND PROCEDURES

- 1.1 Professional Development Review presumes and enacts a professional duty to increase knowledge and to exercise academic freedom grounded in a professional sense of competence, integrity, and continual development.

- 2.1 All departments are required to participate in the PDR process and review all applicable faculty and instructors. Each department's PDR policy is to be reviewed and/or revised every three years and a current copy of departmental PDR policies must be on file in the Dean's office. The PDR Matrix is a document maintained by the Dean's office and regularly updated by each department Chair, which contains the most current schedule for PDRs while enabling compliance with the University policy. Unless otherwise requested in a written document approved by the Chair of the department and the Dean, the PDR matrix constitutes a regular schedule for reviews for all post-tenure faculty and instructors of any rank.

- 2.2 Changes to the review of faculty and instructors are inevitable due to leaves of absence, illness, administrative duties, an unusual number of faculty, and/or instructor reviews in any given academic year within a department, and the desire by an individual faculty member or instructor to use this review as a means to prepare for possible future promotion. All changes to the PDR Matrix must be requested in writing by the Chair of the Department and approved by the Dean as early as possible, but preferably at least a year in advance of the scheduled PDR. All departmental updates to the PDR matrix are to be submitted to the Dean's office by the completion of each PDR cycle (by April 1st).

- 3.1 The goals for the college-level criteria for evaluation are outlined generally here, but each individual department decides for itself what specific documents and procedures to follow (see the document "PDR Best Practices and Supplementary Materials" for suggested submission items

for each criterion). In the case that the PDR Review Committee determines that a particular faculty member has an area of significant deficiency, please refer to section six of this policy.

- 3.1.1 Development Plan:** Though departments may determine what particular criteria to include in the development plan, the PDR process stresses development as one of its central goals. Whatever its final form, the development plan addresses teaching (including SPOTs), scholarship/creative activity, service, advising, and professional development. The plan has two components:
 - 3.1.1.1** Reflection of Past Activity (since last PDR or T&P review);
 - 3.1.1.2** Future Plan for Development (forecast goals for the next 5 years).
 - 3.1.2 Second Systematic Method of Evaluating Teaching*:** Each department defines for itself an additional systematic method of teaching and articulates that method or combination of methods through its own PDR policy approved by the Dean. Whatever the method, the requirements for evaluating teaching are to be applied systematically (consistently and equally among all faculty and instructors) and cover at least two different courses per review (see “PDR Best Practices and Supplementary Materials” for a few possible methods for evaluating teaching).
 - 3.1.3 Supplementary Materials:** Each department may require additional materials that include previous PDR review letters (if any), previous FARs, and/or evidence of any grants, awards, and/or honors received since the last review.
- 4.1 The AddRan clock for PDR reviews begins on the most recent of the following dates: 1) the date of tenure and/or promotion; 2) the date of last PDR; 3) the date of hire (only used for Instructor I faculty who choose not to request promotion to Instructor II). Specifically, in the case of instructors, the PDR process begins at any rank if five years have passed since the last review.
- 4.2 Whenever possible, the PDR schedule could be adjusted to align with promotion reviews as suits faculty members and the departments. Departments are free to complete their PDR reports and recommendations at any point during the academic year as long as they are submitted to the Dean by April 1st of each year.
- 5.1 Each department appoints its own PDR Review Committee constituted of at least two departmental faculty members. Though the Chair is not a member of the review committee, each department chair is encouraged to consult with the review committees before, during, and after each review (AddRan will assist any departments that need additional review committee members from outside of the home department if requested). Required materials for the PDR are largely up to each department to determine through its own PDR policy as long as it is consistent with University and College PDR policies.
- 5.2 The Review Committee in each department reviews all the submitted materials in each PDR case, consistent with departmental goals and those criteria listed in section 3.1, and confers with the reviewed faculty member its conclusions. The Review Committee reports its findings to the Chair of the department.

* As stipulated by Provost Donovan’s directive, “The Teaching Environment at TCU,” (10/2/2012).

- 5.3 By April 1st, the Department Chair sends a 1-page executive summary for each PDR to both the Dean and the reviewed faculty or instructor that includes 1) findings from the Chair based on the Review Committee's report; 2) any comments from the Chair about the PDR. If no significant deficiencies are found, then all other materials are optional (if there are significant deficiencies, then see section 6).
- 6.1 If there are significant deficiencies found by the review committee, then each department Chair submits to the Dean an additional Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) along with the 1-page executive summary from 5.3 above (the reviewed faculty or instructor may also choose to include a rebuttal as an attachment to the PIP). The Chair may also request an additional review as part of the PIP in order to reassess progress toward development at a later date, as well as request additional training and/or professional development from the college. Once the stipulations set forth in the PIP are satisfied, the department Chair may then notify both the Dean and the reviewed faculty member that the review is complete.