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THE REVIEW PROCESS

SEHS has assembled this document to outline the Major and Continuing Renewal review process for all lecturers. The information is intended to offer practical guidance to chairs, departments, lecturers and review committees. This document seeks to clarify the processes involved in preparing and reviewing the cases. It also offers advice on collecting and presenting the materials that most effectively document teaching and service.

For LEO contract purposes, the “academic unit” noun refers to SEHS. Therefore the ultimate decision authority on a contract renewal is the SEHS Dean. The School has established that the department chairs will determine who is to read each case and make recommendations, to the Executive Committee and Dean. This is due to respect for the principle that faculty should serve as the primary evaluators of other faculty. In this document the term Department Chair also refers to Program Directors where appropriate.

There are three levels in the Major and Continuing Renewal review process.


Assembling a review notebook is the responsibility of the lecturer. Notebooks are due to the Department Chair generally by the third week of January. Department Chairs, however, should provide assistance to the lecturer in preparing the notebook. The following are some guidelines that help clarify ways in which the department or program can aid lecturers in assembling and presenting their material for review.

1. The Dean’s Office will provide Chairs with a list of lecturers eligible for Major or Continuing Renewal reviews by September of the Fall semester. The Chair then notifies the lecturers of their impending review and may schedule an initial meeting with the lecturer prior to the end of the Fall semester.

2. Departments should keep in their files copies of annual reports, interim reviews, and course evaluations, and should make them available to the lecturers in a timely manner. Lecturers should also keep complete records of their reports, reviews, and teaching.

3. While lecturers are responsible for assembling and developing materials for their Review Notebooks as well as organizing notebooks as required and assuring all materials are included, the Chair should check for completeness and orderliness of the notebook.
submitted and request missing documentation or reorganization as necessary. Please see the Major and Continuing Renewal Review Standards for LEO Faculty and Major or Continuing Renewal Review Notebook Guidelines documents on the SEHS website.

4. The Chair should write a statement describing the lecturer’s accomplishments and analyzing the progress of the lecturer as an instructor in the department. Service accomplishments and their significance should also be included where appropriate. The Chair will share the statement with the lecturer, who in turn can write a response if he/she sees it appropriate. The Chair then will add the statement and the response, if any, to the notebook and submit it to the Dean’s Office by the second week of March.

If after these efforts, the Dean’s office or Executive Committee deems the notebook incomplete, or the lecturer does not submit a notebook for review, the Dean and the Executive Committee will decide if a one year extension is granted or to issue a termination of contract.

2. **Department deliberations.**

The department deliberations typically take place in February. The notebooks will be assigned to a faculty that are in related areas to the discipline of the lecturer. The department and the Dean will work to avoid any potential conflict of interest in the assignment of notebooks.

The departments must adhere to the standards established in the Major and Continuing Renewal Review Standards document available on the SEHS website. The department is allowed to ask questions to the Dean for clarifications of the standards, and its discussions occur in Executive Sessions closed to outside observers. The department should bring concerns with the completeness or organization of notebooks to the immediate attention of the Dean.

Depending on the type of review, the committee will make one of the following recommendations with attendant consequences:

**LECTURER I or III: 1st MAJOR REVIEW**
- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** results in change of title to Lecturer II or IV and three-year appointment
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS:** Lecturer I - results in notification of termination; Lecturer III – results in a one or two-year terminal appointment as a Lecturer III.
- **PARTIALLY MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** results in a one-year appointment as Lecturer I or III with a remediation plan and another major review
LECTURER II: 2nd MAJOR REVIEW

- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a five-year appointment
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS OR PARTIALLY MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a one or two-year terminal appointment with a remediation plan leading to another major review

LECTURER II or IV: CONTINUING RENEWAL REVIEW

- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a five to seven-year appointment
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS OR PARTIALLY MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a one or two-year terminal appointment with a remediation plan leading to a remediation review

LECTURER IV: 2nd MAJOR REVIEW

- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a five-year appointment
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS OR PARTIALLY MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: results in a one or two-year terminal appointment with a remediation plan leading to another major review

The department chair’s recommendations should consist of a detailed written explanation of the department’s recommendation (samples may be shared with department members by the Dean), including any and all concerns or suggestions for improvement, and a Review Committee Analysis Form (available on the SEHS website) indicating and commenting on levels of success in specific areas.

Everything the department believes should be communicated to the lecturer must be included in the department recommendation. “Meets expectations” assessments should include minor concerns, suggestions, and recommendations for improvement as needed. “Does not meet expectations” and “Partially meets expectations” assessments should address the significant ways in which the lecturer is deemed unsuccessful. Department recommendations must be clear and thorough.

The Department will submit their complete written recommendation (detailed explanation and Review Committee Analysis Form) to the Dean. The Executive Committee and Dean will rely heavily on this report for the final decision.

3. **Dean and Executive Committee Decision.**

The Dean, under advice of the Executive Committee, has the final decision on the renewal of a contract for a lecturer. Department recommendations will be reviewed by the Dean and Executive Committee. This level of review normally takes place in March. The final decision and plans for implementation (renewal, remediation plan, or termination) will be communicated to lecturers no later than April 1.

**LECTURER AND DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Lecturers are responsible for establishing a record in teaching, and service if applicable, that meets the School’s standards for LEO Major and Continuing Renewal reviews. Lecturers are
also responsible for adequately and accurately documenting their record so that it can be carefully and thoroughly reviewed at all necessary levels.

The Department Chair must reflect carefully on the case and write an honest and constructive recommendation.

Departments are expected to take primary responsibility for mentoring and guidance of lecturers. In the area of teaching, Departments need to be proactive in developing regular schedules for peer observations of lecturers. Peer observation is most valuable when it is consistent and occurs periodically through the course of the review period. Departments should assess classroom effectiveness though class observations at least once per year. Department should also keep up-to-date files for the lecturers including syllabi, course evaluations, class observation and annual reports. In the area of service, Departments should meet with the lecturer on an annual basis to establish expectations of meaningful, productive and high quality service.

Annual Reports and Interim Reviews provide a means for the department chair to give clear indications of whether a lecturer is meeting expectations. Lecturers should actively seek clarification of comments or suggestions and should make concerted efforts to address any areas identified as not meeting expectations by the department chair.

Given the nature of the departments, thoroughness in documentation needs to be balanced with conciseness. Where possible, representative and selective samples of evidence of achievements should be submitted. Lecturers are urged to present their materials in a concise, clearly organized manner. Please refer to the Lecturer’s Major or Continuing Renewal Notebook Guidelines document for organization of the notebook. The notebook needs to be thorough but not excessive; only one notebook should be submitted.

Lecturers and Departments Chairs should also adhere to set deadlines and respond promptly to any requests for information or clarification from the department and/or the Dean and Executive Committee. Reasonable extensions may be granted upon request to the Dean.

The Department Chair Statement and the lecturer’s own statements are among the most important portions of the notebook; as both summarize the lecturer strengths, achievements and growth as a colleague and faculty member, and should provide some indication of future development.

**TEACHING AND SERVICE STATEMENTS**

The following information summarizes broad teaching and service expectations for lecturers. Please see the Major and Continuing Renewal Review Standards document on the SEHS website for additional information. The department should look at all documentation presented in the notebook, and reflect on the level at which the lecturer meets expectations.
The teaching section of the notebook (see Major or Continuing Renewal Review Notebook Guidelines documents on the SEHS website), including the chair’s statement and the lecturer’s statement should not be merely a check list, but a coherent and concise statement regarding teaching and facilitation of student learning, and should address most, if not all, of the following as applicable (see Major and Continuing Renewal Review Standards document):

- Approach to teaching and learning. Such as type of classes taught, role of classes in the curriculum, instructional techniques, approach to subject matter, assessment, course design and planning, interaction with students, new course development, use of technology and other tools to enhance learning, revisions, innovations.
- Student evaluations.
- Classroom observations.
- Course syllabi, teaching materials, other course documentation.
- Other documentation of teaching performance. This might include discussion of advising responsibilities, pedagogical conferences and workshops attended, contributions to academic assessment in the department, program development, supervision of student projects, internships, research or theses.

The service component standards derive from the University’s mission statement promoting ‘engaged citizenship,’ and also from the School’s collective commitment to a climate of shared governance. Service is not simply a matter of committee or task force membership, but of meaningful, substantive participation in activities that promote the welfare and betterment of the Department, School, University, community or profession.

The service section of the notebook, including the chair’s statement and the lecturer’s statement should not be merely a check list, but a coherent and concise statement regarding the contributions to the academic community, and should address most, if not all, of the following:

- Evidence of productive and active participation in department or program life, meetings, events, committees, activities, projects assigned to the lecturer
- Active participation in school or university committees or activities
- Contributions to community and/or professional organizations

For service that focuses largely on the Department, the Chair’s statement will likely be the best place to look for quality of the contribution. For Committee or task-force service, other members of that group might be able to comment authoritatively on the quality of the effort. For service to the profession, others within the same field (i.e., members of the same professional or scholarly organizations) should be able to document effort and overall contribution. For service to the community to be considered the contribution should be clearly related to the candidate’s area of expertise (i.e. a scientist lecturing on science-related issues at area high schools, or an artist serving on the board of a gallery).