LAS GUIDELINES FOR LECTURER PROMOTION

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is intended to acknowledge a Lecturer’s commitment to LAS and its students and to recognize his or her pedagogical contributions and accomplishments. This document outlines the policies and procedures for the promotion of Lecturers to the position of Senior Lecturer in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS). These represent the basic criteria and procedures that apply to the evaluation of all Lecturers for promotion in LAS. It is expected that each unit with Lecturers will provide its own more detailed criteria and procedures in conformity with those of the College.

ELIGIBILITY

Lecturers become eligible to be considered for promotion after 3.5 academic years of 100% appointment as a Lecturer occurring within a five-year span. In unusual cases Executive Officers may petition the Dean to have a Lecturer who has not met these criteria considered for promotion (e.g. an outstanding Lecturer with many years of service in a unit where 100% appointments are not available.) Departments can recommend Lecturers for promotion as early as the spring semester immediately following completion of the 3.5 year requirement. Promotion review will take place during the spring semester, with promotion, if granted, effective at the beginning of the next fall semester.

CRITERIA

In order to be promoted to Senior Lecturer candidates must show sustained excellence in teaching. Units may wish to add additional requirements for promotion within the unit. If so, any additional requirements should be detailed in clearly-articulated unit promotion guidelines. They should also be mentioned in the advertisement for the position and specified clearly upon hiring and assigned as duties.
THE REVIEW PROCESS

UNIT REVIEW

1. Units must undertake peer evaluation of all Lecturers’ teaching at least once a year until promotion, including the fall semester of the year during which promotion review takes place. It is recommended that evaluations be more frequent during the first two years. At least one of the peer evaluations included in the packet must be from a tenure-track faculty member. If a Lecturer teaches a variety of courses, efforts should be made to have the courses chosen for review reflect that variety. Please be sure to consult the College process for peer teaching evaluations.

2. There should be an annual written review of all Lecturers to evaluate overall performance and make decisions about renewal. In this review SIT evaluations for courses taught and other evidence relevant to teaching performance should be considered. The review should be shared with the Lecturer.

3. In order to be considered for promotion a Lecturer must be reviewed by a unit committee of at least three people, at least one of whom must be a tenure-track faculty member. It is further recommended that the candidate’s immediate supervisor, if he or she has one, serve on this committee as well. Candidates should provide the committee with items 4-9 of the promotion packet materials listed below. This committee should also be provided with all of the candidate’s SIT evaluation forms and any other materials specified by unit guidelines.

4. Promotion materials should be reviewed and a vote on promotion taken within the unit. Voting eligibility shall be determined by departmental bylaws. Tenure-track faculty should be part of the decision-making body, and it is recommended that all tenure-track faculty vote on promotion cases. Departments may also extend voting eligibility beyond tenure-track faculty. The outcome of the vote must be communicated in writing to the candidate in a timely fashion (please use the template provided), and reported on the transmittal form.

5. The Executive Officer of the unit should provide a recommendation on the promotion to be included in the promotion packet.
COLLEGE REVIEW

In the spring of each academic year the Executive Committee of LAS will review the cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer. A vote on the promotion will be taken by secret ballot. This vote will be advisory to the Dean of the College, who will make the final decision.

THE PACKET

Departments of candidates requesting promotion to Senior Lecturer should provide a packet with the following materials:

1. Transmittal form

2. Copy of the unit’s norms for promotion

3. Contract history at UIC (form provided)

4. A current CV

5. A statement of 2-3 pages (1000-1500 words) describing the candidate’s approach to teaching. This is a key component of the review materials, and should contain a detailed description of the candidate’s pedagogical style and accomplishments. The statement should have concrete examples of what the candidate does in the classroom, teaching challenges he or she has faced and how they were overcome, and specific examples of steps the candidate has taken to improve his or her teaching, including response to feedback or use of campus or other teaching support resources. The statement should also describe the candidate’s understanding of how his or her teaching fits into the overall curricular organization of the unit and of UIC, and how it meets the needs of our students

6. Table of courses taught and selected SIT scores (form provided). If the candidate has fewer than five total years of teaching all SIT scores must also be included as an appendix. If the candidate has five or more total years of teaching at least five years of SIT scores must be included.

7. Copies of annual reviews. If the candidate has fewer than five total years of teaching all reviews must also be included. If the candidate has five or more total years of teaching at least five years of reviews must be included.
8. An evaluation portfolio made up of materials which will facilitate a comprehensive and holistic assessment of the Lecturer’s performance. These materials include:

- A narrative of student evaluations summarizing information from SIT evaluations (both numerical scores and discursive comments). This narrative should be written by the candidate, highlighting both strengths and areas of improvement revealed by the subscores, placing scores in context (e.g. where their scores stand relative to averages for the particular courses they have taught), and noting trends and trajectories over the years.
- All peer teaching evaluations
- List of teaching awards and honors if any
- Examples of syllabi (approximately 3-4), especially those developed by the candidate, should be forwarded to the College as a separate document along with the submission of the packet
- Optional materials. The following materials are optional for College review, but may be required by individual units. Even if not required by the unit, they may be included for consideration:
  - Other materials related to Lecturer duties not specified above
  - Examples of student outcomes such as student awards, publications, performance on common exams or at the next level of instruction, major projects undertaken by students can be included. Spontaneous communications from students that speak directly to the Lecturer’s impact may be included, however, solicitation of student letters or feedback on the Lecturer’s performance is not allowed.
  - List and description (no more than one page) of any curricular, pedagogical or teaching innovations or contributions made by the candidate
  - Statement of service and/or research contributions

9. Examples of syllabi (approximately 3-4), especially those developed by the candidate, included as an appendix

After unit review the following documents should be added to the packet:

10. Record of unit vote

11. Statement with recommendation from the unit executive officer. This statement should refer to departmental criteria for promotion and include specific reasons for the recommendation, including information about teaching challenges faced by the candidate (including any student complaints) and how they were overcome, as well as descriptions of the candidate’s particular strengths and contributions to the unit. The executive officer should be sure that the statement addresses any potential weaknesses in the packet, especially SIT scores that might be perceived as low or comments in student and peer evaluations that might be perceived as negative.