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This document summarizes the type of appointment, responsibilities, and essential criteria for reappointment and promotion, as outlined in the Agreement between The University of Vermont and the United Academics (Agreement, Part-Time Unit) and consistent with the mission and vision of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. The following subsections provide a framework of criteria and standards for evaluation within which judgments regarding the achievements, accomplishments, and future potential of the candidate can be made and which adheres to the philosophy and mission of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences.

In assessing performance, reasonable flexibility should be exercised, taking into consideration the faculty member’s academic rank, the contractual assignment, the faculty member’s self-assessment and progress on goals, professional development efforts and any special considerations.

1. Appointment
The Lecturer position is designated for faculty with primary responsibilities in teaching. In rare cases, advising, service or scholarship related to teaching may be components of the appointment. When advising, service and/or scholarship are components of the appointment, assignment expectations shall be established per the provisions of the CBA. The Lecturer position is a non-tenure track appointment. Only part-time lecturers who are members of the bargaining unit are eligible for promotion.

2. Expectations and responsibilities

2.1 Teaching (primary responsibility of part time lecturers)
Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers. The prime requisite is the possession of expertise in the subject specialty, the ability to create a learning environment that promotes development of student knowledge, skill and competence, and a vital interest in teaching and working with students. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated by a set of indicators consistent with the Agreement. Criteria for meeting, exceeding or performing below expectations in each of these indicators, as well as sources of evidence, are detailed in the CNHS Annual Review Guidelines for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers (ARG-Lecturers).

- Assigned duties for teaching may include: evaluating students’ learning and progress in classroom and/or in clinical settings
- being available to students (through office hours, emails, or by appointment) for consultation on course related issues
  and in some cases may also include:
- teaching in a variety of settings using multiple modalities
- participating in course and curriculum evaluation and development
- mentoring/advising independent studies/projects/research

2.2. Academic Advising (If applicable as this is not an expectation for part time faculty)
If contractually assigned advising duties, lecturers are expected to provide effective academic advising to students. Criteria for meeting, exceeding or performing below expectations are detailed in the ARG-Lecturers.

Assigned duties for academic advising include:
- being available to students (through office hours, emails, or by appointment) for advising related issues
- providing information on professional careers
- providing information on University/Department policies, processes, and procedures

2.3. Service (If applicable as this is not an expectation for part time faculty)

Lecturers may on rare occasions be assigned to participate in Department, College, University, and/or student-related activities. Faculty commitment to service is demonstrated by active participation in the assigned service-related activities. Criteria for meeting, exceeding or performing below expectations are detailed in the ARG-Lecturers.

2.4. Scholarship (If applicable as this is not an expectation for part time faculty)

Scholarship will not typically be assigned to a part-time faculty member. In the rare cases in which scholarship duties are assigned, lecturers are expected to demonstrate sustained and quality scholarly productivity related to teaching. Criteria for meeting, exceeding or performing below expectations are detailed in the ARG-Lecturers.

3. Reappointment and Promotion

Decisions regarding reappointment and promotion shall be based upon the performance in all areas of responsibility commensurate with the position and the assignment agreed upon by the faculty and department chairperson. The performance evaluation should cover the previous qualifying years (i.e., either from initial hire, the last reappointment review, or promotion review, whichever is the shortest, per Agreement). The chair or the evaluator shall take into consideration the faculty member’s self-assessment, professional development efforts, and any special considerations.

When performance evaluations from annual review over the previous qualifying years meet the following standards, faculty should be considered qualified for reappointment or promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reappointment*</th>
<th>Promotion/Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture I</td>
<td>First Reappointment: Meeting Expectations in 80% of the primary indicators in Teaching set forth in the ARG-Lecturers in the last annual review.</td>
<td>• Meeting Expectations in all prime indicators for teaching in the ARG-Lecturers for two out of the last three years. AND • Positive review by relevant colleagues (usually, department/program members) and chair. Eligible for promotion to Lecturer II after Lecturer I has completed six years of teaching at this institution and 36 credits, or taught 60 total credits over any period of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecturer II
Meeting expectations in all prime indicators for teaching as set forth in the ARG-Lecturers since last reappointment. The second reappointment is to occur in the Lecturer’s sixth year and might coincide with promotion review.

- Meeting Expectations in all prime indicators for teaching in the ARG-Lecturers for two out of the last three years.
- Exceeding Expectations in overall teaching performance at least once since last appointment/reappointment at current rank; AND
- Positive review by relevant colleagues (usually, department/program members) and chair.

Eligible for promotion to Lecturer III after 10 years and 60 credits of active teaching service and/or 100 credits at this institution.

Lecturer III
Meeting expectations in all prime indicators for teaching in the ARG-Lecturers for two out of three years since promotion or last reappointment, whichever is more recent.

N/A

* When performances fall short of the standards outlined above for reappointment at either rank, the candidate may be considered qualified for reappointment by providing plans for improvement, and/or letters of support from peers to reflect evidence of effective performance and documented progress in the expected areas.

4. **Reviewers**

4.1. Reappointment
- Faculty is encouraged, but not required, to solicit letters to reflect effectiveness in their teaching. No more than 3 letters should be included.
- These letters will be solicited by the faculty member for inclusion in the review.

4.2. Promotion
- Faculty will be required to solicit letters to reflect effectiveness in their teaching. No more than 3 letters should be included.
- These letters will be solicited by the faculty member for inclusion in the review.

4.3 Evaluation
- A Lecturer who wishes a more formal review shall notify his or her chair by February 1. The lecturer and chair shall mutually agree upon the areas of performance that will be evaluated as well as the process the evaluation shall follow. The promotion process shall follow the procedures as outlined in the CBA. The dean shall make the final decision on promotion.
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This document elaborates on the essential indicators, sources of evidence, and criteria for Meeting, Exceeding, or Performing Below Expectations in each area of responsibility: Teaching, Advising, Scholarship, and Service. The essential indicators in each area are consistent with the Agreement between The University of Vermont and the United Academics and the mission and vision of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers will be evaluated on their performance in all areas of responsibility commensurate with the position and the workload as per the CBA provisions.

In assessing performance, the chairperson will document a faculty member’s performance following these guidelines in each area of responsibility, and shall take into consideration the faculty member’s academic rank, assigned workload plan, the faculty member’s self-assessment and progress on goals for the year, professional development efforts and any special considerations. The annual review evaluation will be a primary source for reappointment and promotion.
## Teaching Effectiveness

Prime indicators of effective teaching include the following a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding Expectation</th>
<th>Meeting Expectation</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellectual competence, integrity and independence</td>
<td>Evidence of making distinctive contributions to teaching b; nominations or recipient of recognitions and awards for teaching</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrating consistent and clear expectations about ethical standards, participating in teaching seminars and other quality enhancement activities; or no evidence of participating in quality enhancement activities when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Willingness to consider suggestions that emerge from peer review of one’s teaching, and/or course evaluation</td>
<td>Evidence of incorporating peer suggestions or new ideas into teaching; and/or making major improvements in course design, development and delivery as the result of course evaluation and/or peer evaluation.</td>
<td>No evidence of participating in peer review; and/or not addressing major concerns from course evaluation and/or peer evaluation in future course design, development and delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ability to present course materials clearly and effectively</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of better than satisfactory c rating.</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of less than satisfactory c rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Capacity to structure the course and its assignments in ways that promote student learning</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of better than satisfactory c rating.</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of less than satisfactory c rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ability to stimulate students’ intellectual interest and enthusiasm</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of better than satisfactory c rating.</td>
<td>Evidence from student course evaluation and/or peer evaluation, demonstrating an average of less than satisfactory c rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Sources of evidence in support of teaching effectiveness may include any of the following, but not limited to: student evaluation; peer observation of teaching and/or teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, readings, practical activities, guest speakers, multi-media & assignments relevant to differences in learning styles, and etc.); new and effective teaching materials (e.g., textbooks, web-based courses, and etc.).

b Examples of making distinctive contributions in teaching may include: mentoring/advising independent/research/advanced studies.

c Currently, each department has its own student course evaluation form. Thus, each department may develop its own criteria for “satisfactory”. However, within the department the criteria must be applied equally to all faculty positions within that department.

### Overall Performance in Teaching: Number of categories in “Exceeding Expectation”: ____ , “Meeting Expectation”: ____ , and “Below Expectation”: ____

## Advising Effectiveness (only applicable if specifically assigned)

Prime indicators of effective advising will include ALL of the following a: (If applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding Expectation</th>
<th>Meeting Expectation</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CNHS Annual Review Guidelines: Lecturer

1. **Availability to advisees**
   - Demonstrates an effective system for making appointments
   - Keeps appointments
   - Allots adequate time for advising meetings

   **Evidence from advisee evaluation,** being rated on average as above “Agree” in “Availability”, or evidence of innovative advising methods (e.g., virtual or extended office hours), attendance or participation in group advising, advising faculty panels and other advising duties.

2. **Responding to advisees’ needs in a timely manner**
   - Respond to inquiries and requests for meetings in timely fashion
   - Initiate actions as appropriate and in a timely manner

   **Evidence from advisee evaluation,** being rated on average as above “Agree” in “Responsiveness”.

3. **Understanding policies and procedures related to the advisees’ major of study**

   **Evidence from advisee evaluation,** being rated on average as above “Agree” in “Knowledge”, or evidence of participating in the review of student manuals and policies in the related majors or programs.

4. **Providing information and guidance on professional careers related to the field of study**

   **Evidence from advisee evaluation,** being rated on average as above “Agree” in “Soundness”.

- Sources of evidence in support of effective advising may include any of the following, but not limited to: the CNHS college-wide advising survey, peer observations, and/or interviews or questionnaires of students and graduates. Note: data from the CNHS college-wide advising survey are not consistently available.

**Overall Performance in Advising:** Number of categories in “Exceeding Expectation”: ____, “Meeting Expectation”: ____, and “Below Expectation”: ____.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service (only applicable if specifically assigned)</th>
<th>Exceeding Expectation</th>
<th>Meeting Expectation</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Prime indicator of service commitment will include the following:

| Assigned service through committee work or other activities relating to the department, college, or University. | Evidence of making a major, significant, and/or important contribution and/or leadership to relevant committees or organizations | Evidence of attending committee or organization meetings and completing assignments. | No evidence demonstrating adequate performance of assigned service (e.g., does not attend meetings regularly, does not complete assignments in timely manner). |

\(^a\) Sources of evidence in support of service commitment may include any of the following, but not limited to: committee meeting minutes, letters, emails, or notes from committee chairs, members, officials or individuals being served.

### Scholarship (only applicable if specifically assigned)
Prime indicators of sustained and quality scholarly productivity if so assigned related to teaching will include any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeding Expectation(^a)</th>
<th>Meeting Expectation(^a)</th>
<th>Below Expectation(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentations</td>
<td>Has two or more activities from any category; or one activity from any category with a significant impact (^c).</td>
<td>Has one activity from any category.</td>
<td>Has no activity from any category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Publications and / scholarly products related to teaching and /or clinical practice</td>
<td>Has two or more activities from any category; or one activity from any category with a significant impact (^c).</td>
<td>Has one activity from any category.</td>
<td>Has no activity from any category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grant activities related to teaching and /or clinical practice</td>
<td>Has two or more activities from any category; or one activity from any category with a significant impact (^c).</td>
<td>Has one activity from any category.</td>
<td>Has no activity from any category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) These expectations assume an annual assignment of 15% in scholarship. If the scholarship assignment is greater than or less than 15%, the number of scholarship activities should be adjusted accordingly. If annual workload in scholarship is less than 10%, scholarship performance should not be evaluated on an annual basis.

\(^b\) Works in progress should be taken into consideration when relevant.

\(^c\) Examples of significant impact may include, but not limited to, being cited by others, in a journal with an impact factor; receiving media coverage, or recognition of professional expertise at regional, national and/or international levels.