

**Department of Mechanical Engineering
of the University of Vermont
Reappointment and Promotion (RP) Guidelines
for Full-Time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**

Approved by ME faculty on Tuesday, December 05, 2017

1. Introduction

In accordance with the Agreement Between the University of Vermont and United Academics (AAUP/AFT) dated 12/12/2014 (referred to as the Union Contract hereafter), this document provides reappointment and promotion guidelines for Full-Time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the Department of Mechanical Engineering (hereinafter referred to as the Department). A Full-Time Lecturer or Senior Lecturer who is eligible for reappointment shall be reviewed for that reappointment before his or her present appointment expires. The reappointment review shall be conducted by the Chair of the Department of Mechanical Engineering

The Department applies the quality criteria for teaching, advising and service that are listed in Article 14 Section 10 in the Union Contract, Appointments & Evaluation: Non-Tenure Track Faculty and has the following additional specifications.

2. Faculty Input and Eligible Voters for RP Reviews

2.1 RP Committee and Meeting

The RP committee shall consist of all full-time tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e. the Committee of the Whole) of the Department excluding the candidate. The RP committee is led by the RPT chairperson, who is also responsible for writing a faithful summary of the meeting discussions. The RPT chairperson is elected from among the full professors in the Department for a term of two years, may not be the Department Chair and lead discussions for all RP and RPT cases. The RPT chairperson is a voting member of the committee.

At the RP committee meeting: (i) all Department faculty members discuss the material in the candidate's dossier, and (ii) all eligible voters (as defined in Section 2.3) discuss the material in the dossier in closed session and then vote by secret ballot on whether or not to recommend the candidate's application during the meeting. The vote will be considered complete when votes cast at the meeting are provided to the Chair at the end of the meeting. Of the Department faculty eligible to vote on the candidate's application, only those present at the meeting, or participating in the meeting electronically, shall be allowed to vote.

2.2 Duties of the Department and RPT Chairpersons

The Department Chair will set an appropriate schedule for each candidate's review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least two (2) weeks before the

ME Department RP Guidelines (Full Time Lecturers & Senior Lectures)

submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Department Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the dossier for faculty review prior to the RP meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RP committee meeting called by the Department Chair at least one (1) week before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The RPT Chairperson will record all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting.

The RPT Chairperson shall prepare a summary of the discussion at the meeting that is approved at the meeting by all voters. The RPT Chairperson will provide a final copy of this summary and a record of the vote to the Department Chair within 24 hours following the RPT meeting.

After considering the feedback from the RP committee and eligible voters' vote, the Department Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will prepare the Department Chair's Evaluation statement. The Department Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete statement, and this statement will also be made available to those voting members of the committee (Section 2.1) who request it in writing.

2.3 Eligible Voters for Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Reviews

- For a Lecturer reappointment with a review: Senior Lecturers, tenure-track/tenured faculty members, and those Lecturers who have successfully passed a reappointment review in the past and are not themselves applying for a reappointment in the current year, are eligible voters.
- For a Senior Lecturer application: Senior Lecturers and tenure-track/tenured faculty members are eligible voters.
- For a Senior Lecturer reappointment with a blue sheet review: tenure-track/tenured faculty members, and those Senior Lecturers who have successfully passed a reappointment review in the past and are not applying for a reappointment in the current year, are eligible voters.
- The Department Chair is not an eligible voter.
- As the College's by-laws require that one of the Department's faculty must serve on the College's Faculty Standard's Committee that elected member must recuse himself/herself from voting in the RPT process at either the Department or College level.
- Full-time faculty on academic leave and on sabbatical are eligible to vote provided they have satisfied the eligibility requirements stated elsewhere in this document.
- Only those present at the RP meeting (Section 2.3), or participating in the meeting

electronically, whereat the merits of the case are considered, are eligible to vote.

3. Guidelines for Reappointment as Lecturer

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Union Contract for evaluation criteria. In addition, reappointment as a Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

- Subject to a regular reappointment review (without explicit expectations for technical research).
- Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
- Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department (consistent with workloads). Examples include committee membership, active participation in Department meetings and events, etc.
- Evidence of maintaining currency in their field of expertise. Examples include professional development activities/training, conference participation, publications, etc.
- Evidence of sustained quality and innovation in teaching (e.g., new courses, laboratory experiments and/or new methods). The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from students and peers as described in Section 6.
- Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
- Evidence of quality student advising/mentoring. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.

4. Guidelines for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Union Contract for evaluation criteria. In addition, an application for Senior Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

- A minimum of 6 years (within an eight-year period) of service, as specified in the Union Contract.
- Subject to a regular reappointment and promotion review.
- Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
- Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department (consistent with workloads). Examples include committee leadership, active participation in Department meetings and events, developing and leading Department initiatives, etc.
- Evidence of significant activity to maintain currency in their field of expertise. Examples include professional development activities/training, conference

ME Department RP Guidelines (Full Time Lecturers & Senior Lectures)

participation, publications, or other scholarly activities (e.g., technical or pedagogical research).

- Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistently good peer and student teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from peers and students as described in Section 6 to assist the candidate in preparing supporting material.
- Demonstration of significant innovation in teaching since last review (e.g., new courses, new experiments and/or laboratories, and/or new teaching methods).
- Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
- Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.
- Evidence of working knowledge of Program and College requirements, procedures, policies, and standards.

5. Guidelines for Reappointment as Senior Lecturer

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Union Contract for evaluation criteria. In addition, reappointment as a Senior Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

- Subject to a regular reappointment review.
- Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.
- Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department since the last review.
- Evidence of maintaining currency in their field of expertise since last review, for example as demonstrated through professional development activities, publications, etc.
- Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistently good peer and student teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). Demonstration of sustained innovation in classroom since last review (e.g., new courses and/or new methods) teaching. The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from students and peers as described in Section 6 to assist the candidate in preparing supporting material.
- Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.
- Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.

6. Teaching Evaluations

6.1 Peer evaluations

Prior to each review, the Department Chair will invite faculty members to observe the candidate's teaching on no less than an annual basis and to provide written observations. Courses taught on a regular basis by the candidate should be evaluated by peers at least once between reviews. The candidate has the option of requesting that specific faculty colleagues not be invited to provide these teaching observations. The final decision on the reviewers rests with the Department Chair.

All peer teaching observations will be done by qualified faculty. (e. g., senior lecturers or tenured faculty in the candidate's Department). The Department Chair, in consultation with the candidate, may invite appropriate faculty members from other Departments to provide teaching observations.

The peer evaluators are requested to examine the candidate's course materials as well as attend at least one of the candidate's lectures. The written reviews shall be presented so as to follow the College's guidelines on peer teaching reviews.

6.2 Student evaluations

Candidates will provide a summary of the numerical scores regarding (i) course quality, (ii) course rigor, and (iii) instructor quality from the teaching evaluations of all courses for the minimum of (i) the preceding five (5) years, (ii) the duration of the candidate's employment if it has been for less than five (5) years, and (iii) the duration since the candidate's reappointment or promotion action. The Department Chair's office will provide copies of all of the students' anecdotal comments for each of the courses taught by the candidate for the preceding two (2) years.

The candidate has the option of providing to the Department Chair the names of students and alumni who may be able to comment anonymously on the candidate's teaching and advising. The Department Chair will solicit up to six such letters from this set. The candidate must not suggest names of students enrolled in the candidate's classes in the semester when such letters are to be solicited.

7. Advising

Candidates preparing their review dossier are advised to have a separate section on advising. In addition to student numbers, it is useful to include other information such as

1. Evidence of knowledge of major, minor, College and University degree requirements,
2. Documentation of availability for student contact,
3. Frequency of meetings and other interactions with advisees,
4. Documented in-service training for advising, and

ME Department RP Guidelines (Full Time Lecturers & Senior Lectures)

5. Documentation of efforts to support the Department in advising.

Although not a requirement, lecturers can be mentors and be involved in undergraduate research, organizations and projects. If candidates are, they should report on these activities.