

LEO Major Review Workshop

Review Materials and Committee

Major Review Criteria and Materials

- Each academic unit shall establish specific written criteria relevant to its own methods of teaching and subject area(s). The specific criteria may address, but are not limited to, the following general criteria: command of the subject matter; ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students; successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials; ability to communicate and achieve appropriate student learning goals; effective interaction with students; growth in the subject field and in teaching methods; performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.
- At a minimum, major review items shall include: course materials; evidence of teaching performance; student evaluations and the Lecturer's response to these evaluations, if any; review of instructional and non-instructional obligations (e.g. grading, delivery, course design, student interaction); annual reports and any written feedback to those reports given previously to the Lecturer; interim review. Lecturers should not be required to submit materials already in the department's possession.

Student Evaluations

- In any review, student evaluations shall not be the sole measure of teaching performance. A small number of negative student evaluations shall not in and of itself constitute grounds for an unsuccessful review. Low student response rate shall also not in and of itself constitute grounds for an unsuccessful review.

Review Committees

- Any major review shall be conducted by a committee of no fewer than three members who will review, evaluate, and make recommendations to the Lecturer's academic unit director/chair or dean as applicable. The committee, when practicable, will include at least one member from the Lecturer's discipline or, if the Lecturer is the only member of a discipline within a department, one member from the department, and may include a Lecturer who has passed a major review.
- Lecturers shall be notified in a timely way of the identities of individuals involved in their review. Lecturers with concerns regarding possible bias on the part of individuals involved in their review must submit their concerns in writing prior to the beginning of the evaluation. Such statements will not be part of the evaluation but will be kept on file with the evaluation.

Classroom Observations

- If classroom observations are a part of the academic unit's review materials, the academic unit will contact the Lecturer to schedule the observation. If the observation is part of the review, prior to the observation the Lecturer may also provide to the observer the framework, plan, and intent of the class. If the academic unit prepares a written report of the classroom observation, the academic unit will provide a copy of the report to the Lecturer, in response to which the Lecturer may provide, in a timely way, additional written information or reflections about the class that was observed. The Lecturer's response, if any, will be appended to the observation report and provided to the person or committee conducting the review. Observations shall be for full class periods, unless otherwise agreed to by the observer and the Lecturer. If the unit intends to videotape the class, faculty and students will be given at least one week's notice.

Responses

- Written evaluation review reports shall be, to the extent possible, consistent with evaluative feedback given to the Lecturer during the review process. Should the Lecturer receive feedback during the review process that is substantially inconsistent from the feedback received in the written reports, the Lecturer can request clarification from the academic unit regarding the inconsistency. In the case of such a request, the academic unit will provide written clarification, to which the Lecturer may respond in writing in a timely way.
- Lecturers may submit a timely response to any review, and that response shall be included in their personnel file attached to the original document.

General Provisions

- Each academic unit will establish and distribute written procedures and criteria for interim reviews, major reviews, and continuing reviews, and procedures for the remediation reviews (if applicable) including procedures for classroom observations, if observations are to be part of a review process. New Lecturers shall receive this information upon commencement of their initial appointment. The Lecturer scheduled for a review shall be notified in the semester prior to the semester of the review of the date(s) by which the Lecturer must submit materials required for a review.
- If an academic unit uses specific measures or benchmarks of evidence to assess performance, the academic unit will inform the Lecturer in writing of the specific measures or benchmarks by July 1 for the upcoming academic year.
- Within any academic unit, all evaluations in a given academic year will involve the application of consistent criteria and procedures for all Lecturers.
- An isolated incident, standing alone, shall not be considered as evidence of a pattern in the evaluation of a Lecturer's performance.
- When a Lecturer routinely teaches in more than one academic unit, at the request of the Lecturer or either academic unit, the units shall meet to determine the review criteria, procedures, and timelines that will apply to the Lecturer's review no later than the end of the second semester of routine teaching in the second academic unit.

Annual Reports

- Once per academic year, each academic unit will notify Lecturers of their obligation to submit an annual activity report and the date the report is due according to the specifications provided by the academic unit's guidelines. The annual report will identify and summarize the Lecturer's performance and achievement relevant to his or her assigned duties during the past year.
- Annual reports submitted by a Lecturer during the time period covered by a review will be considered during that review. If, based on any annual report, the academic unit believes improvement is needed in one or more areas, the academic unit shall provide written feedback on a Lecturer's annual report.
- A Lecturer who does not submit an annual report in a timely manner may, at the discretion of the academic unit, be denied the annual increase. The unit would inform the Lecturer in writing and provide seven days for the Lecturer to submit the annual report

with a written explanation of it not being submitted on time. The unit would then confirm in writing its final decision with respect to the annual increase.

- All Lecturers who work during any part of the annual report period shall be required to submit an annual report, with the exception of Lecturers who are resigning or retiring from the University before the next fall or winter semester.

Interim Reviews

- Following initial appointment as a Lecturer I or III, by no later than the end of the fifth semester (i.e. fall or winter) of appointment, the academic unit shall conduct an interim review of the Lecturer that will be based, at a minimum, on the Lecturer's annual reports, student evaluations, and the syllabi or other equivalent course materials developed by the Lecturer. (Lecturer IIIs in LSA Ann Arbor will be reviewed no later than their fourth semester of appointment.) At the discretion of the academic unit and with notice to the Lecturer, other factors may be considered. This interim review will result in timely written feedback to the Lecturer. If the interim review identifies areas in need of improvement, upon request of the Lecturer, the supervisor or designee shall meet with the Lecturer to discuss those areas and suggestions for improvement. The written feedback, including any clarification by the academic unit and any response by the Lecturer, will be considered during the Employee's subsequent major review.
- Appointments in the Lecturer I title subsequent to passing the interim review shall be in a one-year appointment if the unit anticipates that there will be work for both the fall and winter semesters.

Major Reviews

General Provisions

- Title changes and 7% increases associated with successful major reviews become effective on the 1st of September following successful completion of the review.

Time to Review

- For most units, only fall and winter semesters taught count for time to review. Spring and/or summer teaching may count as time to review in Nursing, Social Work, Education, and Business in Ann Arbor. A maximum of two semesters may be accrued toward time to review in an academic year.
- For Lecturer Is, the first major review occurs during the eighth semester of teaching (either eighth straight or eight out of the last ten). If the eighth semester is during the fall term, the department may delay the review to the winter semester.
- For Lecturer IIIs, the first major review occurs no later than the fourth year of employment in the LIII title.
- For Lecturer LII/IVs, the second major review occurs at the end of the initial three-year appointment in the LII/IV title.
- In LSA Ann Arbor, the department part of the major review of LIIs and IVs may occur as early as the winter of the penultimate year of appointment, with the Executive Committee finalizing the review in the Fall of the final year of the appointment.
- Reviews shall be completed and decision announced prior to April 1 for reappointment in the following September.

Major Review Outcomes

- There are three possible outcomes for an LI's first major review. Successful completion results in presumption of renewal and a three-year appointment in the LII title. An unsuccessful review means the LI will not be appointed past the academic year in which the review occurred and will receive notice of termination. If the LI's performance does not meet the unit's standards for successful completion of a major review, at the discretion of the unit, the LI may be reappointed for up to two years with a remediation plan and another major review.
- There are two possible outcomes for an LIII's first major review. Successful completion results in presumption of renewal and a three-year appointment in the LIV title. If the LIII's major review is unsuccessful, they will be given a one-year or, at the discretion of the academic unit, a two-year terminal appointment. The unit may provide an LIII with a remediation plan and conduct another major review at the end of the remediation plan. Successful completion of this review results in presumption of renewal and a three-year appointment in the LIV title. If this review is unsuccessful, the LIII's appointment will end at the conclusion of the remediation appointment.
- There are two possible outcomes for the second major review for an LII or an LIV. Successful completion of the review results in renewal for an additional five academic years. If the second major review is unsuccessful, the Lecturer will be given a one-year or, at the discretion of the academic unit, a two-year terminal appointment. The unit will work with the Lecturer to develop a written remediation plan, and will conduct another major review at the end of the remediation plan. Successful completion of this review results in renewal for an additional five academic years. If this review is unsuccessful, the Lecturer's appointment will end at the conclusion of the remediation appointment.

Continuing Reviews

- Lecturers who have successfully completed two major reviews shall undergo a continuing review prior to the conclusion of the five-year appointment following the second major review and occurring every seven years thereafter.
- The continuing review will be conducted to advance the professional growth of the Lecturer.
- The review criteria will be consistent with major review criteria.
- A written summary of the continuing review, including recommendations for continued professional growth, along with a list of resources, if applicable, shall be provided to the Lecturer. The Lecturer may request to meet with the supervisor to discuss the review and plans for continued professional growth.
- If a Lecturer satisfies the academic unit's continuing review criteria, the Lecturer will receive an ongoing appointment subject to continuing reviews every seven years.
- If a Lecturer does not satisfy the academic unit's continuing review criteria, the Lecturer will be given a one-year terminal appointment, or at the academic unit's discretion, a two-year terminal appointment, at the outset of which a team will be assembled to address the problems identified in the review. The team shall consist of the Lecturer's supervisor or designee, a representative of the academic unit who has had no prior direct involvement in the review in question, and the Lecturer. The Lecturer may have a representative from the Union present to advise him or her on the content of the remediation plan.

- The team will develop a written remediation plan, which will include but is not limited to the following: areas of performance in need of improvement; specific performance expectations; steps of remediation and timelines for improvement; appropriate resources.
- Both Academic Human Resources and the Union will receive copies of the remediation plan. Once the Lecturer's remediation plan is finalized, the terminal appointment period shall be referred to as the remediation period. At the conclusion of the remediation period, or sooner if the Lecturer and the academic unit agree to conclude the process early, the Lecturer will undergo a remediation review.

Remediation Reviews

- A remediation review will be conducted at the conclusion of a remediation period **following the continuing review**. A remediation will be overseen by the Lecturer's supervisor or designee who will work with the Lecturer during the course of the remediation period. Others, including the other members of the team that developed the remediation plan, may also be identified by the remediation plan as resources to work with the Lecturer during the remediation.
- In the final semester of the remediation period or sooner, 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 regarding the Lecturer's progress in meeting the remediation plan objectives. This remediation review report will recommend the outcome of the remediation. A copy of the report will be provided to the Lecturer. The Lecturer may provide a response to the report, including a self-assessment of their progress, which will be appended to the report. The report, and a response, if any, will go to the Lecturer's academic unit for a decision on the outcome of the remediation.
- This remediation review will be confined to the problems specified in the remediation plan. Newly identified problems, if any, may be addressed informally, or in a subsequent remediation plan, or through the provisions of Article XX., Discipline and Dismissal.
- In the event that the Lecturer's academic unit determines that a failure of remediation review rises to the level of a cause for non-reappointment, the Lecturer will not be reappointed beyond the remediation period.

Intermittent and Adjunct Reviews

- An Adjunct Lecturer shall, upon written request, undergo reviews after their fifth and ninth years of service in an adjunct appointment. If the reviews are successful, they will receive a lump sum payment in an amount equal to 7% of the full-time rate of the adjunct appointment, prorated to the appointment effort in the adjunct title during the semester in which the review was completed. Such payment shall be made no later than the end of the month following the month in which the review is completed.
- An Intermittent Lecturer shall, upon written request, undergo reviews after their fifth and ninth years of service. If the review is successful, they will receive a 7% increase to their full-time rate effective on the 1st of September following successful completion of the each review.