

# University College Guidelines for Lecturer Reviews and Promotions

This document provides (A) the policy for recurring review of Lecturers in University College, (B) the path for promotion to the ranks of Senior and Principal Lecturer, (C) timelines for the review and promotion processes, (D) a rubric for the evaluation of teaching, (E) a rubric for the evaluation of service, (F) general guidelines for assembling a promotion dossier, (G) additional specific guidelines for the teaching portfolio, (H) an evaluation form for classroom observations.

## (A) Recurring Reviews

1. **All Lecturers of all ranks are reviewed regularly each year** by the Promotion and Annual Review Committee (PARC), convened by the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff. This review assesses (1) the Lecturer's performance in undergraduate teaching and mentoring and (2) the Lecturer's service contributions to the College and/or University appropriate to their appointment. As described in the University College Unit 1 Workload Policy, the standard workload allocation is 80% for teaching and 20% for service unless otherwise approved by the Dean or Dean Designate.

The Lecturer under review will submit to the Promotion and Annual Review Committee (PARC) a portfolio incorporating the following materials into a single document (Word or PDF format):

- Current CV
- Teaching philosophy (5,000 words maximum)
- Supporting materials including:
  - A summary of general teaching load, a list of specific courses taught each semester during the year under review, and the final student enrollment for each course
  - Sample classroom materials demonstrating course development
  - Student evaluations
  - Peer teaching observation reports. The Assoc. Dean for Faculty and Staff will work with Lecturers to arrange for one course observation per semester.
- Statement of self-evaluation based upon goals set for the previous year
- Statement setting goals for the coming year
- Statement of professional development and service at UNM and/or in the larger community

2. **Results of the annual review:** The Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff submits a letter to the candidate that evaluates both teaching and service contributions on a scale of "achieves excellence," "meets expectations for effectiveness," or "needs improvement" (sections D and E below provide criteria for evaluating teaching and service contributions, respectively). After confirmation from the Lecturer, this letter will go to the Dean, who will report the review's results to the Provost's office.

### **"Achieves excellence in teaching" or "meets expectations" of effective instruction.**

A Lecturer on a one-year appointment who is found to *achieve excellence* or *meet expectations* for teaching will receive a one-year appointment for the following academic year, contingent on the College's budget and staffing needs. The Lecturer's positive performance review will remain in their file as support for a potential promotion to higher Lecturer ranks. A Lecturer in the non-final year of a multi-year appointment receiving a positive review result will continue with their term appointment.

**Needs improvement to meet expectations.** If a Lecturer on a one-year appointment or the final year of a multi-year appointment *needs improvement* to meet expectations for teaching, the Dean may exercise the University's discretion not to renew the Lecturer's contract. Alternatively, the

Dean may provide the Lecturer with a written remedial plan with specific requirements; the Dean and the Lecturer must both sign this document. A Lecturer in a non-final year of a multi-year appointment receiving a negative review will also be provided a written remedial plan with specific requirements; the Dean and the Lecturer must both sign this document.

3. **Lecturers in their third year** will undergo an annual review that additionally considers their progress toward the rank of Senior Lecturer and the appropriateness of a three-year term appointment. For this process, the Lecturer will submit to the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff a full review portfolio as described above. (See [FHB B3.3.B.3.](#))

## **(B) Promotion to Senior and Principal Lecturer**

1. Lecturers who have completed at least five years of continuous service to the University at 0.5 FTE or greater and have demonstrated professional excellence and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills are **eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer**. With approval from the Dean and Provost, previous temporary part-time teaching in University College can be credited toward this five-year timeline; this arrangement must be described in the Lecturer's initial contract.

2. The candidate for promotion will assemble and submit a dossier to the RPT system.

The Dossier should include the following materials:

- Current CV
- Teaching philosophy
- Peer and student evaluations
- Course materials
- Research statement (optional)
- Service statement
- Supplementary materials

Consult sections F and G below for more details on assembling promotion dossiers.

3. The Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff will convene a Promotion and Annual Review Committee (PARC) composed of at least three UNM faculty who hold ranks above that of the candidate. The PARC will review the candidate's dossier, meet as a committee to discuss the dossier with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff, and submit separate ballots to the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff. PARC evaluations, which follow the template used by the Provost's PARC, ask reviewers to evaluate contributions to teaching, service, and other responsibilities on a scale of excellence, effectiveness, or needs improvement.

4. The Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff will submit a letter to the Dean that summarizes the PARC comments, provides a brief description of the PARC process, and explains the Associate Dean's own evaluations and recommendation.

5. A senior lecturer candidate's dossier will demonstrate *excellence* in undergraduate teaching through the candidate's teaching philosophy, classroom materials, student evaluations, peer classroom observation reports, and any administrative and/or service work that involves field-specific pedagogical expertise. Excellence may also be established through earning competitive recognitions for teaching or publications in pedagogy. A candidate's professional development (if applicable) will also be assessed. A senior lecturer must also demonstrate at least effectiveness in service, as evidence by their CV and service statement. See sections D and E for additional details about teaching and service expectations.

If the promotion is approved by the Dean and Provost, the Lecturer may expect the following.

- Promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- A renewable three-year term appointment.
- A salary increase that is consistent with University College policies and practices.
- The opportunity to apply for one semester of academic leave (See [FHB B3.4](#) and [CBA Article 12](#)) with pay to pursue other academic and/or professional opportunity activities.

6. Senior Lecturers who have completed at least eleven years of continuous service to the University at 0.5 FTE or greater and have sustained consistently high standards in their professional contributions, consistently demonstrated their wider service to the University community and its mission, and shown a conscientious interest in improving their professional skills will be eligible to apply for **promotion to Principal Lecturer**, following the same procedure as described above for promotion to Senior Lecturer. With approval from the Dean and Provost, previous part-time, adjunct teaching in University College can be credited toward this eleven-year timeline; this arrangement must be negotiated in the Senior Lecturer's initial contract.

If the promotion is approved by the Dean and Provost, the Senior Lecturer may expect the following:

- Promotion to Principal Lecturer.
- A renewable five-year term appointment.
- A salary increase that is consistent with University College policies and practices.
- The opportunity to apply for one semester of academic leave (See [FHB B3.4](#) and [CBA Article 12](#)) with pay to pursue other academic and/or professional opportunity activities. A Principal Lecturer will subsequently be eligible to apply for such leave every six years of full-time service.

7. **Denial of Promotion.** In the event of a negative promotion decision (either from "Lecturer" to "Senior Lecturer" or from "Senior Lecturer" to "Principal Lecturer") the Lecturer will retain their former title and benefits, including - if applicable - eligibility for a three-year term appointment. After a three-year period, the Lecturer may reapply for promotion.

## (C) Details of Procedures and Timelines for Reviews and Promotions

These dates are subject to revision to reflect the deadlines set by the Provost's office.

### 1. Annual Review in the first year of appointment

*August–February:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff arranges teaching observations and PARC.

*August–February:* Candidate assembles their portfolio.

*March 1:* Candidate submits portfolio to PARC.

*March 15:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff shares annual review letter with the candidate. Candidate will review and sign the letter, or offer a rebuttal/response to any of its contents.

*March 31:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff submits the final letter, signed by both parties, to the Dean. A copy of the letter will be placed in the candidate's personnel file and submitted to the Provost's office.

### 2. Annual Review in the second and subsequent years of appointment

*August–September:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff arranges teaching observations and PARC.

*September:* Candidate assembles their portfolio.

*October 1:* Candidate submits portfolio to PARC.

*November 1:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff shares annual review letter with the candidate. Candidate will review and sign the letter, or offer a rebuttal/response to any of its contents.

*December 1:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff submits the final letter, signed by both parties, to the Dean. A copy of the letter will be placed in the candidate's personnel file and submitted to the Provost's office.

### 3. Promotion

*September 1:* Candidate informs Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff of desire for review.

*September–November:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff arranges teaching observations.

*December–January:* Candidate assembles their promotion dossier.

*1<sup>st</sup> day of Spring semester:* Candidate submits portfolio to the UNM RPT system.

*February 1:* PARC meets with Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Staff.

*February 8:* PARC members submit individual ballots to the Assoc. Dean for Faculty and Staff.

*February 15:* Assoc. Dean for Faculty and Staff submits summary and recommendation to Dean.

*March 1:* Dean notifies candidate of their recommendation to the Provost.

*June 30:* Provost informs candidate of the final decision.

For further information on reviews and promotions of lecturers, see the [Faculty Handbook B3.3](#) and [Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for Unit 1](#).

**(D) University College Rubric for Evaluating Review/Promotion Portfolios**

Needs Improvement to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations as an Effective Instructor	Achieves Excellence in Teaching
<b>Strong content knowledge</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence that content has changed commensurate with changes in the discipline. <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers express concern about content knowledge in classroom observation reports.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence that content has been updated if the course has been taught over several years. <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge in classroom observation reports.	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains sources of content knowledge for courses, as described in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers enthusiastically praise content knowledge in classroom observation reports. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence of inquiry into how students master content knowledge
<b>Growing knowledge of teaching/learning practice</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Attended no professional development activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended at least one teaching-professional development activity (e.g., CTE, CDL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended two or more teaching- professional development activities (e.g., CTE, CDL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Facilitated a teaching-professional development event for other faculty/TAs <input type="checkbox"/> Published at least one paper on teaching in their discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Awarded at least one grant to improve teaching or training of students.
<b>Adapting/revising to needs of learners</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Shows no evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for continuous improvement in instruction based on multiple inputs from students and observations of student learning challenges (e.g., SGID, surveys, classroom assessment techniques; frequent formative assessment) <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviews comment favorably on evidence of the above
<b>Engage students to learn in the real/virtual classroom</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Shows no evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for using and assessing the impact of multiple interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers) <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviews comment favorably on evidence of the above
<b>Can explain and support choices in content, pedagogy, assessment</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Offers no explanation of choices in content, pedagogy or assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in content based on disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in content based on more than one of: disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of more than one of: developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains specific choices of assessment methods.
<b>Tracking learning outcomes for improvement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Provides no student learning outcomes for their courses. <input type="checkbox"/> Shows no assessment of student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains and provides evidence for assessing student learning outcomes revising curriculum or instruction to improve learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Matches course SLOs to degree- program SLOs <input type="checkbox"/> Serves as coordinator for development, assessment and discussion of departmental SLOs.

**(E) Rubric for evaluating service**

In general, academic service involves positive contributions to (a) the intellectual and administrative life of the College; (b) administration and governance at the University of New Mexico; (c) professions; and (d) local, state, national, and international audiences in ways appropriate to the mission of the College.

The College recognizes that the balance among teaching, service, and other responsibilities will vary over the course of a lecturer’s academic career. Minimum service expectations for junior lecturers consist of active and constructive participation on two College committees per year. Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer should begin to evidence leadership on College committees and/or positive service beyond the department (e.g., to the University, profession, and broader community). Senior lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturers should demonstrate sustained leadership within the College and engagement in the larger University, profession, and/or community.

**Service to UNM:** Lecturers may serve the university in a variety of ways, including work on boards and committees across the university, including the Faculty Senate, the Committee on Governance, and other University committees.

**Service to the profession:** Lecturers should focus on activities that directly draw on or augment their teaching. These might include, but are not limited to, reviewing manuscripts for academic teaching journals and presses, reviewing grant proposals, organizing conferences or panels at professional meetings, and chairing sessions at professional meetings.

**Service to the broader community:** Some faculty may choose to take on the role of public scholars, using their knowledge and skills in service to groups, individuals, and organizations outside the university. Although community service is not required of faculty members when they are considered for promotion, the College views this activity as another element that can be used to judge a faculty member's strengths, again, as long as such commitments do not interfere with the development of a teaching and mentoring record that would support promotion.

<b>University College Rubric for Evaluating Service in Review/Promotion Portfolios</b>		
<b>Needs Improvement to Meet Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations For Service</b>	<b>Achieves Excellence in Service</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Does not participate in at least 2 college-level committees <input type="checkbox"/> Participation on committees is unreliable or is not constructive	<input type="checkbox"/> Constructive and active participation on 2 college committees	<input type="checkbox"/> Takes on significant leadership roles in one or more college committees <input type="checkbox"/> Participates on more than two college committees <input type="checkbox"/> Engagement extends beyond College to include service to the University, Profession and/or Community

## (F) Dossier Organization for Promotion Candidates

When building your dossier, name each document as specified below and save it as a PDF to a folder on your hard drive. After you have received notification that the current version of the RPT application is available, upload your PDF documents to the appropriate dossier sections by the deadlines specified in Section C above.

1. Curriculum Vitae. Because the CV often acts as a summary of your dossier to Provost-level reviewers who may not be familiar with University College and your contributions, your CV should include a short narrative of your teaching, service, and research (if applicable), (about 1 paragraph for each). Typically, this narrative is on the second page of the CV.

2. Teaching Portfolio

Follow the separate (more detailed) Teaching Portfolio guidelines in Section G below, appending documents for the next three sections.

3. Peer teaching evaluations (upload to Teaching Record Section). Name each PDF logically (e.g., Peer Teaching eval by\_LAST NAME).

4. Student Evaluations of Teaching (upload to Teaching Record Section)

5. Course materials

Include the syllabus and just one or two PDF samples of course materials from each course. Name each document: YYYY\_semester\_course number\_ (document name) ♣ NOTE: PowerPoint files must be converted to PDF before uploading. If a .ppt file has audio, video, and/or special animations, place a “read me” doc here pointing reviewers to the Supplemental Materials portion. Upload .ppt file there; original format will be retained.

6. Research Statement (optional)

While research is not required of lecturers, we recognize lecturers do significant research. If you engage in research, this should be part of the record.

7. Service Statement

Discuss your approach to service and describe your engagement at the College, University, professional, and/or community levels.

8. Supplemental Materials

The candidate should consult with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff regarding appropriate supplemental materials to include. Both the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff and the Candidate must sign a list of supplemental materials. All supplemental materials uploaded to the RPT app will convert to hyperlinks, so file size is not limited, nor is type of file. Please include any/all of the below, as agreed upon with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff. You may delete any sections below if they have no content, and add additional sections if necessary, but do not change the numbering convention.

1\_Books Starting with your most recent publication, use the numbering convention below for each book PDF\*.

1.01\_ Book title, complete bibliographic info

1.02\_ Book title, complete bibliographic info

NOTE: Include complete bibliographic information only on the list of supplemental materials. The PDF file name should include only the numbering convention and first few words of the title.

2\_Articles Starting with your most recent publication, use the numbering convention below for each article PDF. (Include complete bibliographic information on this list only; the PDF file name itself need not include anything other than the numbering convention and first few words of the title.)

2.01\_Article title, complete bibliographic info

2.02\_Article title, complete bibliographic info

3\_Research Grants. List each as: 3.01\_YYYY.MM\_Funding Agency, Grant name

4\_Reviews of grant proposals or manuscripts (optional) List each as:

4.01\_description 4.02\_description

5\_Unsolicited letters. Letters may include contributions to community; awarding of prizes; gratitude from students and professional colleagues; contracts for future publications. Multiple letters in the same category, such as student letters, may be uploaded as a single PDF.

6\_Other

6.01\_ (description) 6.02\_ (description)

## (G) Detailed Teaching Portfolio Guidelines

To allow faculty an opportunity to better document the thought and effort they put into teaching, to help guide mentoring of new faculty, and to provide materials for the required annual reviews of faculty, all lecturers should maintain a teaching portfolio. Maintaining an up-to-date teaching portfolio provides many benefits. For faculty undergoing a promotion evaluation review, these portfolio guidelines provide a framework for developing a reflective teaching statement, a required component of the promotion dossier. A **reflective** teaching statement may include but is not limited to descriptions of the faculty member's areas of teaching expertise, courses, or curricular initiatives developed, teaching philosophy, pedagogical choices and methodologies, and responses to student and peer feedback. The statement should convey how the faculty member has developed his or her teaching effectiveness over time, addressing challenges and areas of growth. The complete teaching portfolio also allows you to document and be credited for the thought and effort you put into teaching.

### Teaching Portfolio Contents

Text—not including supplemental and supporting materials—should not exceed 5000 words. Be judicious in your selection of supplemental and supporting materials. You can include a part of a lecture rather than the whole lecture, a syllabus rather than multiple syllabi for the same course, a sample assignment. Choose supporting materials that help demonstrate course discussions in the teaching statement. This should be a reflective document, not just a list of courses you have taught.

#### 1. Statement of teaching philosophy

What are you trying to accomplish in your teaching? What methods do you use to accomplish your goals? How will you know if you have succeeded?

#### 2. Summary of your teaching effort

- a. What is your typical course load during an academic year? What courses do you teach, how many students are in the courses you teach, what level are these students (freshmen, sophomores, etc.)? If you have received any teaching load reductions, please explain.
- b. Are any courses new for you or for the College?
- c. What informal teaching have you done?
- d. Do you participate in service activities related to teaching? Do you participate in funded student training programs (for example, the NIH funded IMSD program)?
- e. Have you participated in any mentoring or coaching programs?
- f. Have you participated in workshops or other forms of professional development intended to enhance your teaching?

#### 3. Documentation of course development

- a. Include complete information for at least one course. Information for more courses, up to three, is desirable if you have taught several courses or courses at different levels.
- b. Give a brief explanation of the reasons behind your choices of each course component. Lengthy course components such as the syllabus itself may be appended to the portfolio.

Course components may include:

- a. Syllabus – is this a standard syllabus for the course? Did you add topics to reflect new developments in the field?
- b. Assignments – these might include quizzes, papers, group work, service components, etc. Why did you choose to include these types of assignments (e.g., students are required to prepare an annotated bibliography so that they begin to read the primary literature)? Describe the assignments in the portfolio. Include the examples as appendices.
- c. What components of your course did you think would increase student engagement? (E.g., I used clicker questions that asked students to hypothesize about the results of experiments such that the students had to produce the possible responses.)
- d. What were your learning goals for this course and how did you know whether students met those goals? What were the major barriers to achieving your goals? (E.g., the room was poorly configured; the students were less prepared than I expected; I could not afford to buy necessary equipment.)
- e. The next time you teach this course, what do you plan to change? Why?
- f. If you have taught this course before, did you change anything? If so, why? Did the change improve student engagement or learning?

#### 4. Peer evaluation of teaching

Include separately in the RPT dossier letters from faculty members who have observed your teaching. Lecturers should aim to have one course observation per semester. You may also arrange for CTE staff to observe your courses. Then, write a paragraph about any changes you will make in your teaching as a result of that evaluation. Reflection on what you have learned from these evaluations is an important component of the portfolio.

#### 5. Student evaluation of teaching

Include a summary of student evaluations of the course(s) described above, a few representative student comments, and other letters from students if you like. This section should be representative, not exhaustive. Include a paragraph interpreting and reflecting on these evaluations of your teaching. Will this change the way you teach the course?

#### 6. If applicable, describe how your scholarship and teaching interact.

#### 7. Any other teaching activities that are important to a representation of the work you do in teaching.

**(H) Evaluation form for classroom observations**

Instructor evaluated \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_

Number of students present \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator(s) \_\_\_\_\_

**The purpose of this classroom observation is to improve faculty performance.**

*Observation Scale: Needs Improvement - Meets Expectations - Achieves Excellence*

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Defines objectives for the class presentation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Effectively organizes learning situations to meet the objectives of the lesson.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Uses instructional methods encouraging relevant student participation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Uses class time effectively.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject matter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Communicates clearly and effectively to the level of the students.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Explains important ideas clearly and effectively.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Demonstrates command of subject matter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Responds appropriately to student questions and comments.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Encourages critical thinking and analysis.

What major strengths did the instructor demonstrate?

In what specific ways might the instructor improve?

Does the instructor generally need improvement, meet expectations, or achieve excellence?