

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF LECTURER III

A Lecturer will be appointed to a Lecturer III title when the individual is hired into a budgeted position, with a broad set of responsibilities, typically including administrative or service functions within the department. The Lecturer III title does not hold the presumption of reappointment. A Lecturer III is appointed annually on a U-Year basis or a multi-year basis for up to but no more than four (4) years of service. Following the initial appointment as a Lecturer III, and no later than the end of the fourth (4th) semester of appointment, an interim evaluation must be conducted of the Lecturer III. A Lecturer III is subject to a major review prior to the completion of the 4th year of his or her successive appointments. A successful review results in promotion to Lecturer IV. Unsuccessful review results in termination of the appointment at the end of the academic year following the review.

1. A copy of this procedure will be provided to the Lecturer no later than the end of the first month of the second consecutive term of his or her appointment
2. The principal criteria governing annual contract renewal of a Lecturer III are: (1) a continuing curricular need for the position, (2) the availability of funding to support the position, and (3) excellence, expertise, and professionalism in the execution of instructional duties by the Lecturer. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs and the College, will determine the continued curricular need and the funding availability during Winter Term of each year of appointment. If the first two criteria are met, the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs will then evaluate the Lecturer and provide a summary of this evaluation, describing strengths and weaknesses, to the Lecturer and to the Chair by March 1 of each year. The Chair will notify the Lecturer of reappointment or non-reappointment by March 31 of each year.
3. The general timeline for the annual review process (Winter Term) will be as follows:
 - Associate Chair provides a written summary of strengths and weaknesses of the Lecturer to the Lecturer and the Chair by March 1 of each year.
 - The lecturer will submit his/her annual activity report as required by all EEB faculty.
 - The Chair will provide notice of reappointment or non-reappointment by March 31 of each year.

INTERIM REVIEW

4. Following the initial appointment as a Lecturer III, but no later than the end of the winter semester of the (2nd) second year of appointment, the department will conduct an interim evaluation of the Lecturer. This interim evaluation will be based on the same materials as required in a major review, as outlined in item 10 below, minus the names of evaluators and letters from the evaluators. With advance notice to the Lecturer, other factors may also be considered. This interim evaluation will be performed by the Undergraduate Affairs Committee, minus the graduate student member of the committee, and will result in

written feedback to the Lecturer by March 31, which will be considered during the Lecturer's subsequent major review.

5. The general timeline for the interim review process in year two (2) will be as follows:
 - January 2 Lecturer is informed of review.
 - February 1 Lecturer provides information to Review Committee.
 - March 1 Review Committee provides feedback to Lecturer.
 - March 31 Lecturer is provided notice of reappointment or non-reappointment.

FOURTH (4th) YEAR MAJOR REVIEW/INITIAL MAJOR REVIEW

6. A major review will take place during the Winter Term of the fourth (4th) year of successive appointments, at which time promotion to Lecturer IV will be decided. The principal criteria governing promotion of a Lecturer III are: (1) a continuing curricular need for the position, (2) the availability of funding to support the position, and (3) excellence, expertise, and professionalism in the execution of instructional duties by the Lecturer. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Associate Chair for Curriculum and the College, will determine the continued curricular need and the funding availability.
7. The general timeline for the fourth (4th) year major review process will be as follows:
 - December 15 Lecturer is informed of review.
 - January 15 Lecturer provides information to Review Committee.
 - March 1 Review Committee submits recommendation to Chair for Executive Committee review.
 - March 31 Written summary of the review is provided to the Lecturer.
 - October 1 Review recommendation is sent to the College for review by LSA Executive Committee.
 - December 31 Lecturer informed of outcome of major review for reappointment the following September.
 - January 1 Salary increase is effective
 - September 1 New appointment becomes effective
8. If the first two criteria for renewal have been met, then a Review Committee will be formed of at least three (3) individuals, including one Lecturer IV (if available) and at least two (2) tenure-track faculty from the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. The Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs will serve as chair of the Review Committee. The other two (2) members will be chosen by the Department Chair from tenure-track faculty and lecturers in the Lecturer's general area of teaching. In the case of joint appointments, a joint Review Committee will be formed. The joint Review Committee will consist of at least three (3) individuals from the two departments, including at least one (1) tenure-track faculty member from the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and at least one (1) Lecturer IV from either department. The Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs of EEB will serve as co-chair of the joint Review Committee and the other member(s) from EEB will be chosen by the Department Chair from tenure-track faculty and lecturers in the Lecturer's general area of teaching.

The Review Committee will not include any faculty member who would encounter a conflict of interest in participating in the review of any Lecturer under review with that committee. Such a conflict of interest would occur in the event of a past or ongoing romantic, sexual, or familial relationship between a member of the faculty of the department and the candidate. Faculty members who have a conflict of interest will not participate in any element of the review process or be present in any discussions of the review.

9. The Department Chair will apprise the Lecturer of the forthcoming review in a letter near 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.
10. The Department Chair's letter will solicit from the Lecturer the following:
 - curriculum vitae;
 - a list of courses taught for the period under review;
 - two (2) sample syllabi from courses taught by the Lecturer;
 - other evidence of teaching performance (i.e., information describing a course website, sample exams, selected lecture notes or other teaching materials, evidence of curricular development, etc.)
 - E & E evaluations for the review period;
 - a statement on teaching philosophy;
 - a list of Department or University service during the period under review (mentoring, committee service, academic advising, etc.);
 - a list of conferences attended, grants awarded, and papers presented, if any;
 - a list of names of other faculty and GSIs who could be asked for evaluations. The Department Chair may add names to this list and will then solicit letters evaluating the Lecturer from individuals on the list.
11. For lecturers with a partial or full appointment in EEB, major reviews will also include a teaching observation following the Peer Review Protocol for Undergraduate Teaching policy approved by the Undergraduate Affairs Committee.
12. The Review Committee will review the materials and may also review other documents related to the Lecturer's specific duties as available. Teaching is the main basis for evaluation, although service and research will also be considered if they are part of the assigned duties of the Lecturer.
13. The Review Committee will submit a written report to the Department Executive Committee and be available for questions when the report is discussed.
14. In the event of a positive recommendation from the Review Committee, the department will prepare a written recommendation to the College regarding the outcome of the major review and the duration of the reappointment and submit the recommendation to the College. In the event of a negative recommendation, the department will send notice of this decision to the College.

15. The College and Department Executive Committee's decision, to reappoint or not, will be communicated in writing to the Lecturer by the Department Chair by March 31. While the report itself is not released, a written summary of the review will be provided to the Lecturer by the Department Chair upon conclusion of the review. The Lecturer may submit a response within two weeks to the written summary, which will be included in his or her personnel file.
16. If the College and Department Executive Committee do not recommend promotion of the Lecturer III to a Lecturer IV, the lecturer will be given a one (1)-year terminal appointment, or, at the department's discretion, a two (2)-year terminal appointment, during either of which the department shall conduct another major review. In the event of a terminal appointment, the department will work with the Lecturer to develop a written remediation plan. If the Lecturer fails the major review following remediation in the terminal appointment, the Lecturer's appointment shall end at the conclusion of the terminal appointment. Successful completion of the review following remediation shall create a presumption of renewal and a three-year appointment as a Lecturer IV.

REMEDIATION PROCESS AND REVIEW

17. At the outset of the remediation process, a team will be assembled to address the specific problems that required remediation. The team shall consist of the Lecturer's supervisor or designee, a representative from the EEB faculty who has had no prior involvement in the review in question, and the Lecturer. The team will develop a written remediation plan, which will include, but is not limited to (a) areas of Lecturer performance in need of improvement, (b) specific performance expectations, (c) steps of remediation and timelines for improvement, and (d) appropriate resources.
18. Both Academic Human Resources and the Union will receive copies of the remediation plan. At the end of the remediation period, the Lecturer will undergo a Remediation Review.
19. The Remediation Review must occur no later than the final semester of the remediation period. The supervisor or designee and the Lecturer will review the Lecturer's progress in fulfilling the terms of the remediation plan. The supervisor or designee will then write a remediation review report that includes a recommendation describing whether the remediation process has been successful or unsuccessful. The EEB executive committee will consider the recommendation and designate the remediation as successful or unsuccessful. In the event of an unsuccessful remediation, the Lecturer will not be reappointed beyond the remediation period. Successful remediation will result in reappointment based upon the policies in place for that level of Lecturer appointment.

Approved by EEB Executive Committee:

March 2, 2005

Revised and approved by EEB Executive Committee:

November 30, 2009

Revised and approved by EEB Executive Committee:

January 16, 2012

Approved by EEB Faculty:
Updated with new LEO contract stipulations:
Approved by EEB Executive Committee:

January 16, 2012
November 20, 2014
April 24, 2015