LSA GUIDELINES FOR MAJOR REVIEWS
OF LEO LECTURERS III AND IV
(Last Updated September 2009)

Background

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.

Major reviews for LEO Lecturers III and IV are governed principally by Article XI and Article XIX (“Performance Evaluation”) of the 2007-2010 collective bargaining agreement between the University of Michigan and the Lecturers’ Employee Organization ("UM/LEO Agreement"). In addition, the College has prepared these supplemental guidelines for reviews of LEO Lecturers III and IV. Departments, Programs, Divisions, Institutes, Centers, and the Residential College (collectively “Academic Units”) also may promulgate major review guidelines (including criteria, procedures for classroom observations, etc.) so long as those guidelines do not conflict with the provisions of the UM/LEO Agreement, the College’s Guidelines, or both. If you have any questions about the Major Reviews of LEO Lecturers III and IV, please contact the Dean’s Office (e.g., the Senior Academic Administrative Specialist or the Academic Labor Relations Representative).

Nothing in this documents 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 2007-2010 UM/LEO Agreement and applicable MoUs for specific provisions governing major reviews. Where used in this document, page references to the UM/LEO Agreement refer to the spiral-bound version of the 2007-2010 UM/LEO Agreement.

LEO Lecturers III and IV – Major Review Schedules and Timing

Lecturers III are appointed for annual or multi-year university-year appointment periods ("UYr") for a total of no more than four (4) years (see Article XI[B][3] – pp. 33-35). 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. 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.

Lecturers IV are appointed for multi-year UYr appointment periods of three (3) to five (5) years, as requested by the Academic Units and approved by the College’s Executive Committee (Article XI[B][4] – pp. 35-37). The major review schedule for a LEO Lecturer IV in LSA is governed by Memorandum of Understanding (“MoU”) #1 – pp. 113-114. The major review may begin, at the earliest, during the winter semester of the penultimate year of the Lecturer’s appointment. It must be completed, and the Academic Unit must send notice of the outcome of the review on or before December 31 of the last year of the appointment. If successful, the Lecturer will be offered reappointment as a Lecturer IV, beginning with the start of the fall semester following completion of the major review. Any raise resulting from the major review will be effective January 1 of the last year of the appointment.
Major Review Criteria, Guidelines, and Review Materials:

A. Criteria – The Academic Units’ major reviews are critically important parts of the process used to ensure excellence, expertise and professionalism in the execution of assigned duties for our Lecturers. The general criteria governing major reviews of Lecturers III and IV are excellence, expertise, and professionalism in the execution of assigned duties.\(^1\) Specific criteria may address, but are not limited to:

1. Command of the subject matter;
2. Ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students;
3. Successful design and/or planning of course materials (as appropriate);
4. Ability to communicate and achieve appropriate student learning goals;
5. Effective interaction with students;
6. Growth in the subject field and in teaching methods;
7. Performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.

(Article XIX[D][3] – p. 77)

B. Guidelines – Academic Units will review Lecturers according to the College’s and their own written guidelines, developed with specific relevance to their discipline and methods of instruction.

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.

C. Review Materials and Elements:

The guidelines developed by the Academic Units must conform to the UM/LEO Agreement and applicable MoUs, and to the College guidelines, by including the following elements:

1. Review Committee – The unit will appoint a review committee of at least three (3) faculty members that includes at least two (2) tenured/tenure track faculty members (the Review Committee may include Lecturers, at the discretion of the Academic Unit).
   a. The committee will not include any faculty members 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 or program and the candidate; this is not intended to be an exhaustive list

\(^1\) The factors considered in reappointing Lecturers include (1) continuing curricular need; and (2) availability of funding to support reappointment. Curricular need and funding availability are determined by the Academic Unit and the College.
of potential conflicts of interest. 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 case.

b. The Academic Unit conducting reviews may choose to create separate review committees for individual Lecturers, or a single review committee to review the appointments of all Lecturers in the unit. In the latter event, it is permissible for the committee to consult with other faculty members when special disciplinary expertise is required for the review, or to rely upon ad hoc committees for classroom observations.

c. Within any Academic Unit, all evaluations in a given academic year will involve the application of consistent criteria for all Lecturers (Article XIX[A][5] – p. 75).

d. In the case of a Lecturer holding a joint appointment (i.e., Lecturer appointments in more than one Academic Unit within the College), a joint review committee will be formed. The joint committee will include either:

   i. All members from each of the Academic Units’ review committees, or

   ii. A subset of members from each of the Academic Units’ review committees such that the joint review committee consists of at least three (3) faculty members, and includes at least two (2) tenured or tenure-track faculty.

2. A thorough assessment of review materials will be conducted and a written summary of the evaluation provided to the Lecturer and placed in the Lecturer’s personnel file (Article XIX[D][5] – p. 78).

3. At a minimum, review items shall include (Article XIX[D][5] – p. 78):

   a. Course Materials and Other Evidence of Teaching Performance – the documentation must be thoughtful and thorough and should include the following:
      1) Two (2) sample syllabi from course(s) taught by the candidate;
      2) Report(s) from classroom visitation/observation (depending on Academic Unit policy)

      If classroom observations are a part of the major review, written procedures for the observations must also be established and distributed (Article XIX[A][3] – p. 74)

   3) A table showing:
      a) Each course taught
      b) The enrollment in the course
      c) The mean grade for the course (where available)
d) The Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 E&E scores for the course(s)

e) Departments should also provide comparative Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 E&E data for the same or similar courses taught by other faculty.

f) Mean grade data is also requested for the Lecturer and comparison faculty.

Mean grade and enrollment data are available from the LSA Management Reporting System (“MRS”); the table should not include the names of other faculty.

g) The average of the Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 scores for the Lecturer

h) The average Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 scores for the same or similar courses taught by other faculty

4) Other evidence of teaching performance, including but not limited to:

   a) Information describing a course Website;

   b) Selected sample of tests that demonstrate alignment of assessment techniques with course goals;

   c) Selected sample of lecture notes or other teaching materials; and

   d) Evidence of dissemination of teaching methods through workshops, presentations, publications.

b. Student Evaluations (including Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 information identified above);

c. Review 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);

d. Annual Reports; and


4. Review items may also include, but need not be limited to:

   a. Current Curriculum Vitae

   b. Teaching Statement

   c. E&E Evaluation Summaries – for each course taught since the last major review;

   d. Academic Advising (if applicable, provide number of advisees over the period covered by this review, the nature of the contacts with the students);
e. **Curricular Development** (e. g. contributions to improve teaching quality in the Academic Unit, involvement in the unit’s assessment efforts, mentoring of other faculty, etc.); and

f. **Supervisory Skills** (if applicable).

**Academic Unit and College Executive Committee – Roles and Timelines**

Based on a review of the materials considered, the Academic Unit review committee will prepare a written report to the Chair or Director of the Academic Unit recommending a successful or unsuccessful major review outcome.

In the event of a **positive recommendation**, the academic unit will prepare a written recommendation regarding the outcome of the major review and the duration of the reappointment (i.e. three (3), four (4) or five (5) years). The Academic Unit will submit the recommendation to the College in accordance with the following schedule:

a. Lecturers III:

   i. Lecturers III are not covered by MoU#1; their major reviews must take place entirely within the last year of their appointment (i.e., the two-step process of an Academic Unit review and a College Executive Committee review must take place entirely within the last year of the appointment).

   ii. As such, the Academic Unit portion of the major review of a Lecturer III must be completed, and recommendation forwarded to the College on or before November 12 of the final year of the appointment.

b. Lecturers IV:

   i. In accordance with MoU #1, the College expects the Academic Unit’s portion of the major review will be completed prior to the end of the winter semester of the penultimate year of the Lecturer’s appointment.

   ii. Because, under MoU#1, the review must be completed and decisions announced prior to December 31 of the final year of the appointment, the College needs to have the Academic Unit’s recommendation on or before November 1\(^2\) of the final year of the Lecturer’s appointment for consideration by the College Executive Committee.

In the event of a **negative recommendation** (i.e. the Lecturer fails the major review at the Academic Unit level), the Academic Unit must send notice of this decision to the College within the timelines outlined above.

---

\(^2\) The November 1 deadline for Academic Units’ recommendations for Lecturers III may move to a later date (e.g. December 31) for the 2009-2010 Academic Year.

\(^3\) The November 1 deadline for Academic Units’ recommendations for Lecturers IV may move to an earlier date (e.g., October 1) for the 2009-2010 Academic Year.
A copy of the Academic Unit’s recommendation to the College Executive Committee will be provided to the Lecturer in writing.

Outcome(s) of Major Reviews

1. Lecturers III
   
a. **Successful completion of major review** – if the College Executive Committee determines that the major review is successful, 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 between three (3) and five (5) years, as recommended by the Academic Unit and approved by the Executive Committee (Article XI[B][4][b][ii][a] – pp. 35-36). The outcome of the major review will be announced prior to April 1 for reappointment the following September.

   b. **Unsuccessful completion of major review** – if the College Executive Committee determines that the major review is unsuccessful, the Lecturer will be given a terminal year appointment (i.e. the Lecturer’s appointment will end at the end of the year following the review). At its discretion, the Academic Unit may conduct a second major review in the terminal year. If a Lecturer III undergoes and fails a major review in the terminal year, he or she will not be reappointed (Article XI[B][4][b][ii][b] – p. 36).

2. Lecturers IV
   
a. **Successful completion of the major review** – if the College Executive Committee determines that the major review is successful, the Lecturer will be reappointed as a Lecturer IV for a period of between three (3) and five (5) years, as recommended by the Academic Unit and approved by the Executive Committee (Article XI[B][4][c][ii][a] – p. 36). The outcome of the major review will be announced prior to December 31 of the final year of the appointment.

   b. **Unsuccessful completion of the major review** – if the College Executive Committee determines that the major review is unsuccessful, the Lecturer will be given a one-year terminal appointment (Article XI[B][4][c][ii][b] – p. 36). 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 in the terminal year, his or her appointment ends at the end of the terminal year.