

The Department of Electrical & Biomedical Engineering Reappointment and Promotion (RP) Guidelines for Full-Time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

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 Electrical & Biomedical Engineering (EBE) (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 EBE Department (hereinafter referred to as the Chair).

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. Faculty Input and Schedule for RP Reviews

The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for each review so that the complete dossier will be ready for viewing by Department faculty *at least 2 weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office*. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the blue sheets.

Once the candidate's dossier is ready for faculty review, all full-time faculty members, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier.

There will be two avenues for faculty input regarding the candidate. The first is through anonymous written comments to the Chair prior to the Department RPT meeting and the second is through verbal comments faithfully recorded by the Chair during the Department RPT meeting, as described below.

As per Section 14.10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Chair shall summarize anonymous individual comments from the Department faculty. This

summary will be shared with the EBE Department RPT committee (hereinafter referred to as the RPT committee).

The RPT committee shall consist of all tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty (i.e. the Committee of the Whole) of the Department.

At the beginning of the second week after the candidate's review dossier is complete, the RPT Committee will convene a two-part meeting of the faculty to discuss the contents of the candidate's dossier as well as other areas of performance of the candidate expressly assigned and clearly defined by the Chair. The first part of this meeting is for all faculty where non-eligible voters may share their comments. This is followed by the second part with only the eligible faculty voters who will vote by Australian ballot on the candidate's reappointment or promotion. Only those RPT Committee members present at the meeting shall be allowed to vote. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) 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 comments and vote will be included in the Chair's Evaluation.

After the above faculty feedback and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's application, and will inform the candidate of this recommendation and will provide them with a copy of the Chair's Evaluation.

2.2. 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 Chair is not an eligible voter.
- Only those present at the meeting, 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement 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.
- 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement 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 participation, publications, or other scholarly activities (e.g., technical or pedagogical research).
- Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistent above average teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). 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.

- Demonstration of significant innovation in teaching since last review (e.g., new courses, new experiments and/or laboratories, and/or new methods).
- 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 Collective Bargaining Agreement 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.
- Demonstration of significant 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.
- 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 Student provided 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 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 may also provide to the Chair the names of former students who have completed their degree. These alumni will be invited to provide letters in which they opine on the candidate's teaching and advising. In addition, the Chair may solicit input from current students on the candidate's teaching and advising in the form of anonymous letters.

6.1 Peer provided evaluations

Prior to each review, the 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 Chair.

All peer teaching observations will be done by qualified faculty. (e. g., senior lecturers or tenured faculty in the candidate's Department). The 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.

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
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 this activity.