

Final - January 6, 2016

University-Level Guidance:
Evaluation and Promotion Processes and Criteria for Lecturer Faculty

I. Establishment of Evaluation and Promotion Processes and Criteria

By the end of the fall semester, 2015, each college will develop its criteria and processes for granting promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer, consistent with overarching University guidelines and in accordance with CBA Article 13.4.1. Representatives of Lecturer Faculty must be actively included in the creation of the college and department promotion criteria and process. The authority for final approval of the college's criteria and processes rests with the Dean.

By February 26, 2016, the Colleges will review and assign incumbent Lecturer ranks.

II. Assignment of Individual Lecturer Faculty Rank and Responsibilities

Appointments and reappointments are at the discretion of the Dean. Department Chairs, Program Coordinators, and Directors, with the approval of the Dean, assign courses and other responsibilities. Please see appendix 1 of this document and the Collective Bargaining Agreement for further guidance.

III. Annual evaluation processes/materials

Regular Reviews - During the Lecturer's appointment (see CBA Article 11: Appointments and Assignments), the college dean or his/her designee shall provide Lecturer Faculty with a written performance review annually by May 1. The written review shall convey an assessment of overall performance, including any necessity for improvement and growth, as well as any areas of excellence. The written review will indicate clearly, at a minimum, whether the Lecturer Faculty member is a) exceeding, b) meeting, or c) not meeting expectations, and the reasons therefore. The Dean, Dean's designee, or Department Chair will also promptly convey, where and when appropriate, the resources and mechanisms to foster professional development and improvement.

The College Dean's or her/his designee' written evaluation will be informed by a written review prepared by the Lecturer Faculty member's Chair or his/her designee.

Prior to submitting the written review to the College Dean or his/her designee, the Department Chair shall hold a review meeting with the Lecturer Faculty, unless waived by the Lecturer Faculty. The purpose of the meeting is 1) to provide candid, respectful, and objective feedback, 2) to enhance professional development of the faculty member, and 3) to document the outcome of the review.

Following the review meeting, the Department Chair shall sign and date the written review. The Lecturer Faculty shall also sign the document to indicate receipt of the written review. Should the Lecturer Faculty disagree with the content of the written review, he or she may provide a rebuttal letter. The rebuttal letter shall be included in the review documentation submitted to the College Dean or his/her designee, for inclusion in the Lecturer's personnel file.

The Chair's (or designee's) review and the Dean's (or designee's) evaluation will be informed by the following and other relevant and disclosed factual information:

Annual reporting - All Lecturer Faculty shall complete an annual report at the close of each academic year using the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) platform or such other mechanism as designated by the University. The FAR should include teaching, professional, service, and administrative activities (If and when possible, FAR should be tailored for use by Lecturer Faculty because the current form forces too much of Lecturers' activity into the narrative section.)

A current curriculum vitae including teaching, professional, service, and administrative activities should accompany the FAR. Accomplishments and activities undertaken during the evaluation year should be highlighted.

As part of FAR, Lecturer Faculty will complete the "Self Assessment of Past Year and Plans for Upcoming Year/Additional Information", which will provide the lecturer's self-reflective narrative of teaching and service, including, but not limited to:

- Brief summary of work performed
- Brief self-evaluation of each course taught
 - o Course accomplishments/goals met
 - o Challenges encountered and lessons learned
 - o Areas to improve on in future teaching
- Assigned PSA and SAS activities
- Proposed goals for the coming year
- Proposed PSA and/or SAS activities for the coming year
- Other material the Lecturer Faculty deems relevant, including additional professional activities

Lecturer Faculty seeking guidance about completing the FAR should contact the Lecturers Council (who will have sample documents available) and/or their Department Chair.

All Lecturer Faculty shall be responsible for maintaining copies of original course evaluations, including the written qualitative student comments, and course syllabi for each year of service. Course syllabi should be submitted to the Department Chair each year. Course syllabi should contain desired student learning outcomes.

Chair observation - An announced classroom observation, by physical or virtual means, of each Lecturer Faculty by the Department Chair, Program Coordinator, or their designee shall occur at least once per review period (i.e., annually). At the discretion of the Chair, the Lecturer Faculty member will a) meet with the Chair or b) be provided a written version of the criteria the Chair will be using, prior to the observation, to understand the evaluation criteria that will be used. The Chair or her/his designee (e.g., the Associate Chair or Program Coordinator) will provide a written assessment of the Lecturer Faculty's teaching to him/her within two weeks of the assessment. The assessment will be included in his/her personnel file. (See appendix for possible observation rubric.)

Peer observation - The Lecturer faculty member may choose – and are encouraged -- to request an announced classroom observation, by physical or virtual means, by a peer evaluator once per the Lecturer's appointment period (e.g., one, three, or five years). Peer observation is particularly important for first-year Lecturer Faculty members who may be new to teaching and require more guidance.

The peer evaluator should be from a closely related discipline when possible. The peer evaluator will be jointly chosen by the Department Chair or Program Coordinator and the Lecturer Faculty member. If the two are unable to agree upon an evaluator, the Dean, Associate Dean or designee shall make a determination. The peer evaluator will make the Lecturer Faculty member aware of the evaluation criteria she or he will be using. The evaluator will provide a written assessment of the Lecturer Faculty's teaching to him/her and to the Department Chair or Program Coordinator within two weeks of the assessment. The assessment will be included in his/her Personnel File.

Please see below for criteria to be considered in the Chair (or designee) and peer observations.

The peer observer should use the same evaluation rubric used in the Chair/designee observation.

Faculty at the rank of Lecturer may be evaluated by Senior or Principal Lecturers, and Associate Professors or Professors. Senior Lecturers may be evaluated by Senior or Principal Lecturers, and Associate Professors or Professors. Principal Lecturers may be evaluated by Principal Lecturers, Associate Professors, or Professors.

IV. Evaluation criteria

Statement of Purpose - The consistent improvement of employees, especially as it applies to teaching and mentoring, is crucial to the educational mission of the University. The performance review should provide candid, respectful, and objective feedback as part of a reflective professional development process. Lecturer Faculty will be reviewed on the full range of their workload, as outlined in CBA Article 12: Workload Activities of Lecturer Faculty, which is acknowledged to primarily be teaching, but may include other activities.

Lecturer Faculty members are engaged and supported by the University during the academic year solely to fulfill teaching and related activities as defined in Article 12: Workload Activities of Lecturer Faculty. Lecturer Faculty will not be evaluated on any research activities in which they may engage on their own time, nor may those activities conflict in any way with the individual's teaching and other responsibilities mutually agreed upon with the Department Chair.

Lecturer Faculty shall encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They shall hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Lecturer Faculty shall demonstrate respect for students and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors.

Evaluation criteria and expectations are to be fully communicated to lecturers in written form by the Department Chair and/or Program Coordinator. Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty will take FTE status into account. Whereas quality standards should not vary, the amount of work expected should be consistent with the assigned FTE.

A. Teaching

Teaching Activities will be evaluated based on course evaluations from students, classroom observation, the information provided by FAR, samples of assignments and student work, and other relevant and disclosed factual information. The evaluation will indicate clearly whether the Lecturer Faculty member is a) exceeding, b) meeting, or c) not meeting expectations in the area of teaching, justifying the reasons therefore and recommending paths to improvement as appropriate. In general, teaching will be evaluated based on quality and effectiveness, and whether or not the Lecturer is meeting the reasonable needs of students through availability during scheduled office hours, appointments, and online.

Other specific activities associated with teaching on which the Lecturer Faculty may be evaluated are listed in 12.4.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

Colleges and departments should be clear about the role of student evaluations in overall assessment of Lecturer Faculty performance. If numerical evaluation scores are used as important factors in evaluation and promotion, the target scores for Lecturer Faculty should be consistent with reasonable norms. Numerical evaluation scores, if used as a significant factor in evaluation, should be considered in comparison to college, department, and course level student evaluation reports provided by UNH Institutional Research for the most recent academic years. In addition, if numerical evaluations are used, a holistic review of the responses to all evaluation questions, not just overall reaction to the course, should be considered in the assessment.

Low numerical scores may, but do not necessarily confirm ineffective teaching, and high numerical scores may, but do not necessarily, confirm effective teaching. The Department Chair and Dean will consider potential mitigating factors such as number of hours spent, expected grade, level and size of class, number of classes missed, and response rate.

If and when feasible, written student comments should be linked with numerical evaluations.

Completed student evaluations should be provided to Lecturer Faculty members as soon as possible, and within the first two weeks of the following term, to allow Lecturer Faculty to apply any necessary changes to his/her course after analyzing evaluations.

Note: Voluntary mid-semester evaluations, administered by the UNH Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, can be particularly helpful in assessing and improving teaching.

Observations of Teaching

Specific criteria for teaching observations may be developed by departments and Lecturers. Criteria to be considered in the observation may include, but are not limited to:

- Teaching consistent with syllabus
- Clearly discernible lesson plan
- Teaching material current with the discipline
- Effective organization of course content
- Effective delivery of content material
- Questions, discussion, and tasks appropriate for the course level
- Engagement/enthusiasm of students, including participation from a variety of students
- Efficient use of class time
- Effective use of educational technology where appropriate for course subject

A. Professional and Service Activities (PSA).

Assigned Professional and Service Activities completed during the annual review period will be evaluated based on the Department Chair's or her/his designee's assessment of quality of execution of those assigned duties, including information in the FAR.

A non-exhaustive list of Professional and Service activities on which the Lecturer Faculty may be evaluated are listed in 12.4.2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

The extent, appropriateness, and quality of professional and service activities should be carefully considered. Chairs and Deans will clearly indicate in writing, at a minimum, whether the Lecturer Faculty member's PSA activities are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations, justifying their reasons therefore and recommending paths to improvement as appropriate. An affirmative evaluation of PSA represents the conclusion that the lecturer is making a positive contribution appropriate to his or her program/department/discipline.

B. Substantial Administrative Service (SAS).

Assigned Substantial Administrative Service completed during the annual review period will be evaluated based on the Department Chair's or her/his designee's assessment of the quality of execution of those assigned duties, including information in the FAR.

A non-exhaustive list of Substantial Administrative Service activities on which the Lecturer Faculty may be evaluated are listed in 12.4.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

The extent, appropriateness, and quality of Substantial Administrative Service activities should be carefully considered. Chairs and Deans will clearly indicate in writing whether the Lecturer Faculty member's SAS activities are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations, justifying their reasons therefore and recommending paths to improvement as appropriate.

C. Pedagogical Development Leaves (when applicable):

Criteria for evaluation:

- Value (or importance, or prestige value to the institution)
- Outcome(s) that meet specific teaching or service needs of the department or college.
- Documented completion of the proposed project(s).
- Development of expertise in a new area of pedagogy of importance to the college and UNH

V. Promotion Process

Lecturer Faculty are responsible for the assembly and submission of their own materials for consideration of promotion to Senior and Principal Lecturer.

Promotion Committees- Promotion to Senior Lecturer will be granted by the College Dean, based on the recommendation of the promotion committee and the judgment of the Dean. The promotion committee will be comprised of the Department Chair, Director or Program Coordinator, at least one Lecturer of higher rank, and at least one other tenure track faculty member at the Associate or Full Professor rank in that department or program. Efforts shall be made to include committee members with similar disciplinary background. If the department has no Senior or Principal Lecturers, one will be selected by the Dean from a closely-related department.

No member of the Promotion Committee may have a familial relationship with the candidate. In such cases where the requirements of CBA Articles 13.4.1.1 and 13.4.1.2 cannot be fulfilled, an appropriate alternate committee member shall be selected by the College Dean.

Promotion Timeline – Once a Lecturer meets the criteria required for consideration of promotion, they may initiate the promotion review process. While there is no minimum or maximum number of years of service for eligibility for promotion, it is typical that the process for promotion to Senior Lecturer be initiated in the seventh year of continuous or cumulative employment at the rank of Lecturer. It is typical that the process for promotion to Principal Lecturer be initiated in the sixth year of continuous or cumulative employment at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

Ongoing Promotion Process Timeline - The Promotion Committee will submit its recommendation to the Dean by February 1 of the year in which the case is heard. The Dean will inform the candidate and the Provost of his/her decision on the case by March 15.

Any Lecturer Faculty has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the Grievance Article if he/she is not promoted and can prove that the processes were not properly followed or that the college's approved criteria were applied in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

It is acknowledged that there is no “up or out” policy for Lecturer Faculty.

VI. Non-renewal at end of appointment period

Notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, it is expected that non-renewal following the end of an appointment period may occur for any reason that is not based upon illegal discrimination or is otherwise in violation of any term of this Agreement.

VII. Fairness

No decision or action that affects a Lecturer Faculty member may be made in an arbitrary or capricious manner. Administrative decisions that have an effect on individual Lecturer Faculty shall be consistently applied to the extent that similarly situated individuals in equivalent circumstances will be treated in a comparable manner.

APPENDIX I

Assignment of Individual Lecturer Faculty Rank and Responsibilities

All Lecturer Faculty appointments or reappointments at any rank are at the discretion of the Dean on the basis of curricular need, sufficiency of financial resources, and satisfactory performance as defined by CBA Article 13: Performance Reviews and Promotion.

The Department Chair, Program Coordinator, or Director assigns courses and duties to Lecturer Faculty, with approval from the Dean. Workload assignments must be fair and equitable.

Taking primarily into account the needs of their departments and the students they serve, work assignments of Lecturer Faculty will be consistent with their expertise and experience. Seniority will be a contributing factor in the assignment and scheduling of courses.

The lecturer appointment letter shall specify the number of Teaching Activities, PSA, and/or SAS units expected (as outlined in CBA Article 12: Workload Activities of Lecturer Faculty).

Appointment letters for continuing lecturers shall be offered by March 1 for lecturers who are in their first or second year, and by January 15 for lecturers who are in their third year or thereafter. Timing of these letters should also take into account the needs of Lecturer Faculty who are in the United States on visas. Those lecturers will be granted early letters, if needed, in accordance with OISS timeline for visa purposes. To achieve this timing, it is the responsibility of the Lecturer to notify the Chair and Dean's office no less than three months in advance.

The University will inform continuing Lecturer Faculty members of their teaching and administrative duties a minimum of six weeks in advance. When significant, unforeseen changes to duties become necessary, the University will promptly inform the Lecturer Faculty member of any change(s) and the reason for the change(s).

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers are under no research or creative scholarship expectations.

For 1.0 FTE Lecturer Faculty the academic-year workload standard is eight (8) units. For a 0.88 FTE Lecturer it is seven (7) units, and for a 0.75 FTE Lecturer it is six (6) units. Three categories of units are Teaching, Professional and Service Activities (PSA), and Substantial Administrative Service (SAS). The definition of a "unit" is associated with the time, energy, and actions it takes to teach one standard 3- or 4-credit class.

All Lecturer Faculty will have at least one unit of PSA in their workload. Except as outlined in CBA Article 3.1, each unit of SAS performed to meet departmental, programmatic, or college, or university needs is the equivalent of one unit of Teaching. Any such exchange of units is solely the prerogative of the department, program, or college.

Lecturer Faculty will meet annually with their Program/Department Chair or Coordinator to review the portfolio of activities that will meet their PSA requirement for the year.

Lecturer Faculty members shall have the right to request a college-level review of their workload by the Dean or his/her designee(s) at any time. Should the review result in a dispute that elevates to a grievance, this review shall be considered the "informal consultation" prescribed in Article 14: Grievance Procedure.