



Review Procedures for LEO Lecturers III and IV

Background

Major reviews for LEO Lecturers III and IV are governed principally by Article XI (“Appointments, Major Review, and Renewal”) and Article XIX (“Performance Evaluation”) of the 2010-2013 collective bargaining agreement between the University of Michigan and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization (“UM/LEO Agreement”). In addition, LSA has prepared supplemental guidelines for reviews of LEO Lecturers III and IV.

Nothing in this document is intended to supplant or supersede any provision of the UM/LEO Agreement, or any applicable Memoranda of Understanding between the University and LEO (“MoUs”). Please consult the 2010-2013 UM/LEO Agreement and applicable MoUs for specific provisions governing major reviews.

A copy of this procedure will be provided to the Lecturer at the time of their first appointment. This procedure follows the LSA Guidelines for Major Reviews of LEO Lecturers III and IV.

Definition of Lecturer Titles

In general, Lecturer III and IV appointments are for positions that include instruction, significant, ongoing administrative or service duties, and require a range of instructional expertise.

LEO Lecturer III: appointments are for positions that include instruction, significant ongoing administrative or service duties, and/or require a range of instructional expertise; appointments are made for annual or multi-year university-year appointment periods (“UYr”, September 1-May 31) for a total of no more than four (4) years and do not carry presumption of renewal.

LEO Lecturer IV: appointments are for positions that include instruction, significant ongoing administrative or service duties, and/or require a range of instructional expertise; appointments are made for multi-year UYr appointment periods of three (3), five (5), six (6) or seven (7) years, as determined by PitE and approved by the LSA Executive Committee and carry presumption of renewal.

Review Timeline, Process and Results

LEO Lecturer III: No later than the end of the fifth semester of appointment, PitE will conduct an interim evaluation, which will be based on the Lecturer’s annual reports, student evaluations, and syllabi. A LEO Lecturer III who has held appointments for up to but no more than four (4) consecutive academic years shall undergo a major review consistent with the evaluation procedures in Article XIX. If successful, the Lecturer will be offered reappointment as a LEO Lecturer IV with “presumption of renewal” beginning with the following Fall semester for a period of three (3) years and a seven percent (7%) increase in base salary. The major review and decision will take place during the last year of the appointment in the

Lecturer III title and shall be completed and decisions announced prior to April 1 for reappointment beginning with the start of the fall semester following completion of the review.

LEO Lecturer IV: The major review schedule for a LEO Lecturer IV in LSA, and thus PitE, is governed by Memorandum of Understanding (“MoU”) #1 – pp. 162-163, as well as Article XI and Article XIX. A second major review and decision will take place during the last year of the appointment in the Lecturer IV title and shall be completed and decisions announced prior to December 31 for reappointment beginning with the start of the fall semester for a period of five (5) years and a seven percent (7%) increase in base salary following completion of the review. A Lecturer IV who has successfully completed two major reviews will undergo continuing renewal reviews in accordance with Article XIX.E., prior to the conclusion of each subsequent appointment as a Lecturer IV. Successful completion of a continuing renewal review shall result in renewal for an additional five (5) to (7) years.

Review Criteria

The principal criteria governing appointment renewal and promotion are:

- a. a continuing curricular need for the position,
- b. the availability of funding to support the position, and
- c. excellence, expertise, and professionalism in the execution of instructional and other assigned duties.

The Director of PitE (the Director), in consultation with the Associate Director and the College, will determine the continued curricular need and the funding availability. All major reviews are to be conducted with the thoroughness and inclusiveness of a third year review of the teaching performance of a tenure-track faculty member.

Review Process

1. If the first two criteria for renewal have been met, then a review committee will be formed of at least three faculty members, which includes at least two tenure track faculty members. The Director or his/her designate will serve as chair of the review committee. The other members will be chosen by the Director from tenure-track faculty who either have an appointment in PitE or are PitE Faculty Associates, and any PitE lecturer in the Lecturer’s general area of teaching who has passed a major review.
2. The Director will apprise the Lecturer of the fact of the review in a letter at least by the end of the term prior to the term in which the review will take place. The Lecturer will be told the names of the members of the review committee.
3. The Director’s letter will solicit from the Lecturer the following materials:
 - a. A current curriculum vitae.
 - b. A statement on teaching philosophy.

- c. Two sample syllabi from recent courses taught by the Lecturer.
 - d. Other evidence of teaching performance may be included, but is not required (e.g., samples of student work, results from own course evaluations; copies of assignment instructions, selected tests that demonstrate alignment of assessment techniques with course goals; sample lectures/discussions; teaching awards, description of course Website(s),etc.)
 - e. A summary of administrative and service duties performed since the Lecturer began working in PitE or the Lecturer's last major review.
4. In addition, PitE will provide the following evidence of teaching performance:
- a. A copy of the E&E evaluation summary for each course taught since the Lecturer began teaching in PitE or the Lecturer's last major review.
 - b. A table showing each course taught; the enrollment in the course; and the following data for the course as well as the same or similar courses taught by other instructors:
 - i. average grade
 - ii. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 E&E scores
 - iii. average Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 E&E scores
 - c. Interim reviews (if applicable).
 - d. Optional: a report from a classroom visitation by members of the review committee or a representative selected by the Director.
5. The review committee will also evaluate the Lecturer's performance of instructional and non-instructional obligations (e.g., grading, student evaluations, delivery, unit-specific service responsibilities such as student recruitment efforts, development efforts, ad hoc committees).
6. The review committee will submit a written report and be available for questions.
- a. In the event of a positive recommendation, PitE will prepare a written recommendation to LSA regarding the outcome of the major review and the duration of the reappointment (i.e. three (3), four (4) or five (5) years). A copy of PitE's recommendation to the College Executive Committee will be provided to the Lecturer in writing.
 - b. In the event of a negative recommendation, PitE will send notice of this decision to LSA. A copy of PitE's recommendation to the College Executive Committee will be provided to the Lecturer in writing.
7. If the LSA Executive Committee determines that the major review is successful:
- a. Lecturer III: the Lecturer will be granted presumption of renewal, and an appointment in the Lecturer IV title. The Lecturer IV appointment will be for a period of three (3) years, as recommended by PitE and approved by the LSA Executive Committee. The outcome of the major review will be announced prior to April 1 for reappointment the following September.
 - b. Lecturer IV: the Lecturer will be reappointed as a Lecturer IV for a period of five (5) years, as recommended by PitE and approved by the Executive Committee. The

outcome of the major review will be announced prior to April 1 for reappointment the following September.

8. If the LSA Executive Committee determines that the major review is unsuccessful:
 - a. Lecturer III: – The Lecturer will be given a one-year, or at discretion of the PitE Director, a two-year terminal appointment. At the discretion of the PitE Director, PitE may provide the Lecturer III with a remediation plan and may conduct another major review at the end of the remediation plan. If a Lecturer III undergoes and fails a major review following remediation in the terminal year, he or she will not be reappointed.
 - b. Lecturer IV: The Lecturer will be given a one-year terminal appointment, or at the discretion of the PitE Director a two-year terminal appointment. The Academic Unit must (a) work with the Lecturer to develop a written remediation plan and (b) conduct another major review during the terminal year. If the Lecturer IV fails the major review following remediation in the terminal year, his or her appointment ends at the end of the terminal year.

Approved by the PitE Faculty Advisory Committee January 29, 2010
Revised July 12, 2011