July 1, 2015

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Full-time Renewable-Term Associates, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in [Discipline]

FROM: David Madigan, Executive Vice President for Arts & Sciences

RE: 2015-16 Guidelines for Review of Full-time Renewable-Term Associates, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in [Discipline]

In April 2004, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate approved the creation of a professional career track that allows the Arts and Sciences to appoint and continue to employ valuable teachers who would otherwise be subject to the "up-or-out" rules and the tenure review system designed for research faculty. Faculty in these instructional roles are appointed at the rank of Associate in [Discipline], Lecturer in [Discipline] or Senior Lecturer in [Discipline]. They are appointed for a stated term and may be part-time or full-time. The terms are renewable and are not subject to the limits on non-tenured service. In applied fields in which there are no terminal degrees, graduate degrees are less important, and determination of rank will depend on candidates' experience and accomplishment in their fields of professional practice.[1]

The rank of Associate in [Discipline] is appropriate for individuals who have a special competence in a given field but do not qualify for the title of lecturer. Such individuals will have training in the given field but less than two years of teaching experience.

The rank of Lecturer in [Discipline] is appropriate for individuals who are earlier in their career or have not yet attained that high level of achievement expected of a senior lecturer in discipline. Such individuals will have substantial teaching experience with documented evidence of pedagogical excellence and evidence of professional growth and activity in the given field. Evidence of growth and activity includes, but is not limited to, making contributions in the areas of research, creative or policymaking activity appropriate the lecturer's specific assignment.

The rank of Senior Lecturer in [Discipline] is appropriate for individuals who have a superlative record of teaching as a lecturer and documented evidence of excellence in carrying out administrative or other department responsibilities such as directing specific courses; have contributed to the training of teaching fellows and served on department and university committees; shown continued professional growth and activity in the

[1] Those members of the Special Instructional Faculty appointed with modified titles in Arts and Sciences departments where the discipline is language pedagogy are also referred to as Associates in [Language], Lecturers in [Language], and Senior Lecturers in [Language]. Details on appointment types for Officers of Instruction are found in the Columbia University *Faculty Handbook* at http://www.cc.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/fhb/main.html

given field. Evidence of growth and activity includes, but is not limited to, making contributions in the areas of research, creative or policymaking activity appropriate to the lecturer's specific assignment.

Procedures for Appointment

It is the responsibility of the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences to approve the creation of every full-time lecturer-in-discipline position. A department wishing to appoint a new associate or lecturer in this career track must make such a request in writing to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences as part of the unit's regular Instructional Budget Statement.[2]

Statutory Terms of Appointment

By university statutes, all initial appointments are for one year only. Subsequent appointments may be for a term of one, two, or three years. Passage of the major review and subsequent continuing reviews carry the opportunity for reappointment for a term of up to five years.

The University may choose not to renew an appointment beyond its stated term because of budgetary considerations, changes in staffing or curricular needs, or less than optimal performance on the part of the officer. In such cases, the University must give written notice according to the following schedule:

(1) not later than March 1 before the end of the first year of service (March 1, 2016);
(2) not later than December 15 before the end of the second year of service (December 15, 2015);
(3) at least twelve months before the end of all subsequent periods of service (May 31, 2016)

Review Schedules

Associates in [Discipline] are reviewed for renewal of appointment in the first, second, fifth, and eighth year of service. Promotion to lecturer in discipline is possible at the time of the second-year review.

Lecturers in [Discipline] are reviewed for renewal of appointment in the first, second, fifth, and eighth years of service. Promotion to senior lecturer in discipline is possible at the time of the eighth-year review.

Senior Lecturers in [Discipline] undergo a major review prior to appointment or during their first year of service and continuing reviews every five years thereafter.

[2] The School of Continuing Education and School of the Arts should make such requests through their Dean.

Types of Reviews

Confirming Review (First Year). The first year of service for all full-time faculty, regardless of rank, serves as a probationary period. A decision must be made whether to extend the statutory initial appointment. Those who successfully complete the probationary period will be extended for an additional year. Those who do not should be notified in writing by March 1, 2015 that their appointment will not be renewed beyond June 30, 2015.

Developmental Review (Second Year). The developmental review takes place before the end of the second year, at which time a department may decide to make a third year terminal or to recommend continuation for three years. In the case of an Associate, promotion to the rank of Lecturer may be considered at this time.

Critical Review (Fifth Year). The second professional review takes place the end of the fifth year, at which time a department may decide to make the sixth year terminal or to recommend continuation for three more years into the eighth year.

Major Review (Eighth Year). The third professional review takes place before the end of the eighth year, at which time a department may decide to make the ninth year terminal or to recommend extension for an additional five years.

Continuing Reviews (Every Five Years). All subsequent reviews are to be conducted at the end of each five-year cycle, with either a recommendation for an additional five years, or a recommendation for non-renewal after a terminal year. Reviews from the thirteenth year on are to be conducted by the department chair and at least two other faculty (either professorial or lecturer track with one member being trained in discipline pedagogy and the other being external to the department, but not necessarily external to the University).

Promotion to Lecturer in [Discipline]

To recognize strong performance of an Associate in Discipline in a program the university will consider conferral of the title Lecturer in [Discipline]. Promotion to Lecturer does not alter the review schedule. Proposals to promote an Associate to Lecturer may not be made before the end of the second year. The completion of a successful second-year review does not necessarily entail promotion to Lecturer. A department should propose candidates for promotion to Lecturer only when the following qualities are demonstrated:

1) substantial teaching experience and documented evidence of pedagogical excellence;

2) evidence of professional growth and activity in the field in the areas of research, creative or policymaking activity appropriate to the associate's specific assignment

Promotion to Senior Lecturer in [Discipline]

To recognize high performance of a Lecturer in [Discipline] in a program the university will consider conferral of the title Senior Lecturer in [Discipline]. No promotions in rank or title are possible beyond Senior Lecturer in [Discipline]. Promotion to Senior Lecturer in [Discipline] does not entail tenure. Proposals to promote a Lecturer in Discipline to Senior Lecturer in [Discipline] may not normally be made before the eighth year of service.

Procedures for Review

In all cases, beginning with the developmental review in the second year, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will require evidence of a full and complete departmental review of the candidate's work. Reviews in the second, fifth, and eighth years should include evaluation by a three-person review committee. The department chair will appoint a three-person committee to conduct a review and make a recommendation to the department for renewal or non-renewal. It is important that at least one member of the review committee be an expert in the lecturer's area of research, creative or policymaking activity and at least one member of the review committee be external to the department, but not necessarily external to the university. The department will deliberate on the committee's recommendation. The outcome of those deliberations will be communicated to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences in a letter of transmittal.

The review process should entail:

1) examination of the candidate's dossier, which includes an updated curriculum vitae, a statement of teaching philosophy, a statement of professional work in progress, and samples of course materials such as syllabi, handouts, and supplements;
2) evaluation by each of the three reviewers of classroom performance composed after observing at least two classes, and a review of student evaluations for all classes taught by the candidate since the last review (if applicable). The evaluations composed by the three reviewers should be attached to the letter of transmittal to the standing committee. Copies of all student evaluations should be submitted to the standing committee along with the summary data page for each set of student evaluations.

The following will be assessed through a review of the statement of teaching philosophy, classroom observation, and the student evaluations: 1) strategies used to promote student involvement/attentiveness; 2) strategies used to meet the needs of all learners; 3) reflection of pedagogical goals as reflected in the work assigned to students; 4) strategies

for engaging students in activities within and outside the classroom; and 5) consonance between pedagogical practices and the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy.

The following will be assessed through the examination of the curriculum vitae and the statement of professional work in progress: 1) evidence of professional growth in the field; 2) active involvement in the field or profession either at Columbia or nationally; and 3) professional leadership experience and performance.

Report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee

In instances of a positive vote by the department, the chair of the department will prepare a letter of transmittal to be sent to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences. The letter will record the result of the departmental vote and summarize the basis for the department's positive recommendation. It will include a discussion of the candidate's teaching load and course enrollments and be accompanied by an analysis of teaching performance. The statement will analyze the available data and reports of teaching observations as they reflect both the instructor's strengths and areas in need of attention. The letter should also speak to the department's recommendations at the last review as well as to the candidate's responses to them. The letter should be accompanied by the candidate's full dossier: curriculum vitae, the statement of teaching philosophy, the statement of professional work in progress, samples of course materials such as syllabi, handouts and supplements to the text, and written reports of classroom observations and post-visitation discussions from each of the faculty members who observed the candidate's class and examined the student evaluations. **Please see Appendix B below for instructions on submitting the dossier in PDF files.**

In instances of a negative vote by the department, the chair of the department will notify the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences of the departmental decision. The chair will then notify the candidate in writing of the negative decision. Candidates not being recommended for renewal will be given a terminal year of appointment.

Departments must submit their recommendations to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences by March 1, 2016. The Executive Vice President will then seek input from the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee will review the dossier and make a recommendation to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences. The Executive Vice President will write to the chair of the department regarding the outcome of the review, with a request that the chair inform the candidate in writing with a copy to the Executive Vice President. Candidates must be sent letters informing them of their continuing status no later than June 30, 2016, and in the case of non-renewal no later than May 15, 2016. It is the chair's obligation to convey to the candidate any concerns about his or her performance as well as any improvement that will be expected at the next scheduled review.

Appendix A

Review Schedule for Associates, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in [Discipline]

Review Schedule	**Consequences**
End of year one; (internal)	A) Recommend for one more year B) Notify will not be renewed
End of year two (internal and external)	A) Decision to make third year terminal B) Recommend for three-year contract and promote to lecturer if relevant
End of year five (internal and external)	A) Appoint only 1 more year B) Appoint 3 more years and consider promotion to lecturer if relevant
End of year eight (internal and external)	A) Appoint only 1 more year B) Renew for 5 more years C) Consider promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer if relevant
End of thirteenth and subsequent five-year intervals (internal)	A) Appoint only 1 more year B) Renew for 5 more years C) Consider promotion to lecturer or senior lecturer if relevant

Appendix B

Submission of the Lecturer in Discipline Review Dossier

The dossier should be submitted electronically on a flash drive to the Office of Academic Affairs. The materials submitted electronically should be put into a ".pdf" file with no protection or security restrictions. In preparing the flash drive, the nominating unit should follow the checklist below for the contents and name of each file and for the order in which they should be included. Avoid using scanned copies of the materials when possible because such materials are generally not searchable.

1. Chair's Letter of Transmittal	Lastname_Firstname_transmittal.pdf
2. Departmental Review Committee Report (if any)	Lastname_Firstname_report.pdf
3. Reviewer 1 Evaluation	Lastname_Firstname_Reviewer1.pdf
4. Reviewer 2 Evaluation	Lastname_Firstname_Reviewer2.pdf
5. Reviewer 3 Evaluation	Lastname_Firstname_Reviewer3.pdf
6. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae	Lastname_Firstname_cv.pdf
7. Candidate's Teaching Philosophy and Professional Work in Progress	Lastname_Firstname_statement.pdf
8. Candidate's samples of course materials	Lastname_Firstname materials.pdf
9. Student Evaluations	Lastname_ Firstname_Student_Evaluations.pdf