

**LECTURER
MAJOR and CONTINUING REVIEW**

in the

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Guidelines and Process

2021-2022

**Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Engineering
University of Michigan**

Table of Contents

**Major Review and Continuing Review Guidelines
College of Engineering 2021-2022**

<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/majorreview/>

A. Timetable of Major Review and Continuing Review Process.....	3
B. Instructions for the Department Chair	4
C. Instructions for the Major/Continuing Review Candidate	5
D. Instructions for Committees.....	6
E. Sample Letter for Internal Letters from Colleagues	8
F. Sample Letter for Internal Letters from Students	9
G. Guidelines for Electronic Submission and Casebook Document Format.....	10
H. Template casebooks	14

A. *Timetable of Major Review and Continuing Review Process*

2021

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER

ADAA sends email to departments indicating the Lecturers due for Major Review or Continuing Reviews in 2021-2022 and notifying about upcoming process and significant dates. Departments in turn notify the affected Lecturers.

ADAA requests for major review committees sent to Department Chairs

OCTOBER

October 6 Department major review committee recommendations due to ADAA. May consist of any three CoE faculty members (including lecturers who have passed a major review or continuing review)

October 13 Distribution of review materials. Guidelines and templates on ADAA website:
<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/majorreview/>

2022

FEBRUARY

**February 4
12:00 noon** Deadline for submission of electronic casebook to ADAA.

February 4 Department Chairs inform candidates of department recommendation of major review or continuing review. If this is done by letter or email, ADAA should be copied.

MARCH

Early March CoE Executive Committee meets to discuss casebooks.

Week of March 28 Associate Dean for Academic Affairs sends letters to candidates informing them (with copy to the Department Chairs) of Executive Committee recommendation of major review or continuing review.

B. Instructions for the Department Chair

Please ensure that your department's major review lecturer candidate(s) and casebook committee(s) are informed about these guidelines and instructions. Casebook committees should be given deadlines to meet your department's review requirements, and lecturers should be advised about working with their committees. The major review guidelines may be downloaded from the ADAA website:

<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/lecturers/>

Departments are responsible for the quality of the major review casebooks. Casebooks that do not meet the standards as specified in the *Major Review and Continuing Review Guidelines*, under Section G "Detailed instructions for preparation of major review and continuing review casebooks", may be returned to the casebook committee for revisions. Casebooks that fall well below the preparation standards may jeopardize the outcome of the major review or continuing review. Inconsistencies between the recommendations and the compiled record will be noted by the Executive Committee and the casebook may be sent back with questions. Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including internal letters of evaluation, or candidate's CV) will be returned.

We have included a timetable in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in this process. An electronic copy of each casebook will now be generated through SmartPath and must be submitted by **February 4, 2022**. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the ADAA Office.

Please be sure the committee chair, casebook committee, and candidate all receive a list of the candidate's casebook committee members.

C. *Instructions for the Candidate*

Your department will provide a list of the committee members for your case and inform you of the guidelines and instructions for your review. A timetable is included in the guidelines to summarize the most important steps and dates in the process.

Major reviews and continuing reviews for lecturers in the College of Engineering are normally performed during the winter term. The reviews are internal to the College; only in unusual circumstances would a committee obtain information from outside the University of Michigan. The reviews are conducted in accordance with the Lecturers' Employee Organization union contract as found in Articles XI and XIX. Your committee will consist of one committee chair and two committee members, typically from the department or program in which you teach. Reviews will be completed by late March 2021, at which time you will hear from your department chair or program director and receive a letter from the ADAA Office.

The *Major and Continuing Review Guidelines for the College of Engineering* may be downloaded at: <http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/lecturers/>. Please note that you are responsible for a substantial portion of the casebook and you should coordinate your schedule with that of the committee. Casebooks will now be generated using SmartPath. Please provide the following to the Chair of your Major Review/Continuing Review Committee by uploading the documents to <https://engin-umich.mntnpass.com/cv>:

- a) A copy of your academic curriculum vitae, suitable for transmission to the internal evaluators; and
- b) A copy of the course syllabi from your last two terms of instruction or, if the syllabi were outside of your control, a teaching philosophy statement.

For those undergoing a **Major Review**, in addition to (a) and (b) above, please provide a list of 2 to 4 names of potential internal faculty evaluators and 2 to 4 students. (Do not reach out directly to potential reviewers.) These students may be currently enrolled or former students who have graduated. Faculty evaluators must be at a rank equivalent or above your current rank. If there are potential faculty evaluators or students who you feel may not provide a fair or impartial letter of recommendation due to a personal conflict, please provide these names to the Major Review committee chair, along with a brief explanation. If, for some reason, the committee chooses to contact one of these individuals, you will be notified.

For those undergoing a **Continuing Review**, in addition to (a) and (b) above, please provide a brief (1-2 pages) teaching statement/reflection of the semesters since undergoing the last major review.

If you have questions about the review process, please feel free to contact the ADAA Office.

D. *Instructions for MR/CRR Committees*

Among the most important decisions for continued excellence and vitality of the College of Engineering are those related to faculty appointments and promotions. In this process, you have an extremely important role. As a member of a Major Review or a Continuing Review committee, you will prepare the evaluative documentation and provide a primary recommendation regarding the candidate. The College Executive Committee will base its decision on this material. The Executive Committee needs and expects a concise and forthright evaluation and a high-quality casebook.

Please take note of the following:

1. The **required format** for the casebooks is specified in the *Major Review and Continuing Review Templates*. Any casebook exceeding 20 pages (not including internal letters of evaluation, or candidate's CV) will be returned.
2. Although not all are specifically included in the Major Review casebook, per the LEO contract, at a minimum, review items shall include:
 - a. course materials;
 - b. evidence of teaching performance;
 - c. student evaluations provided by the department (and employee response, if any);
 - d. review of instructional and non-instructional obligations (e.g., grading, student evaluations, delivery); and
 - e. annual reviews.Please be sure to review these materials while building the casebook, however, only the materials noted in the casebook template should be supplied for review by the Executive Committee.
3. For a **Major Review**, if the MR Committee seeks letters from individuals whom the candidate felt may not provide impartial review, you must notify the candidate. Letters are not required for Continuing Reviews.
4. For a **Major Review**, a classroom visit must be completed by a committee member. The requirements for this observation are as follows:
 - a. This visit must be coordinated with the lecturer in advance. If the observation will be recorded, the lecturer and students will be given one week's advance notice.
 - b. The lecturer may provide the observer with a framework, plan, and intent of the class prior to the session.
 - c. The observation must be for a full class period unless otherwise agreed to in advance.
 - d. A written report of the observation should be prepared; the lecturer must be given a copy of the report.
 - e. The lecturer may provide a written response to the report within 10 calendar days to give additional information or reflections about the class that was observed. This response must be included in the casebook.
5. Your department/program needs to submit the casebooks to the ADAA Office via SmartPath by **February 4, 2022** so please make sure that the casebooks are submitted to your department chair/program in time to support this schedule.
6. These reviews are confidential. Do not disclose your findings to anyone not involved in the review decision.

Please keep in mind that the review committee is an evaluative committee, not an advocacy committee, and the candidate is best served in the long run by a fair and candid review of the record. Accordingly, the committee is requested to indicate areas of both strength and weakness, which may also be included in the ADAA letter to the candidate communicating the decision of the Executive Committee. While the casebook is evaluative, the resulting letter(s) of recommendation from the committee are expected to endorse a conclusion based on these facts. This letter is your opportunity to express your overall judgment about the case.

If you have any questions on the format or any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact the ADAA Office.

The major review and continuing review guidelines can be found at:
<http://adaa.engin.umich.edu/lecturers/>

E. *Sample Letter for Internal Letters from Colleagues (needed for Major Review Only)*

Letters will be generated through SmartPath. The following is provided for information only.

To: [name]

From:

Subject: Letter of Assessment for [Lecturer's Name]

Date:

The College of Engineering is conducting a review of the teaching of [Lecturer's Name], as part of a regular evaluation process for contract renewal. We are writing to ask you to write a letter assessing the teaching accomplishments and future promise of this individual, including both positive points and areas needing improvement. Recognition of the quality of our instructors' work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process, and we value your candid assessment. Your professional evaluation will play an important part in our review of [Lecturer's Name].

We specifically ask you to comment on [Lecturer's Name]'s

- Expertise in the field (in as much as you feel able to assess this);
- Ability to organize and plan the course, and communicate learning goals;
- Ability to convey the material effectively (including presentation in a clear and organized way, clear explanations of difficult concepts, effective answering of student questions); and
- Ability to interact effectively with students, including providing constructive feedback on student work, and assessing the achievement of learning goals.

Please add any other comments you believe to be relevant to the casebook.

We are attaching the [Lecturer's Name]'s CV. If there is any other information that you believe you need for your evaluation, please contact [relevant name and email address].

The decision to be made on [Lecturer's Name]'s review is a very important one, both for the candidate and for the College of Engineering. Input from colleagues, such as you, is a vital ingredient in our review process. We appreciate your effort to respond as fully as you can to the questions above. We realize that your schedule is busy and that this may be a time-consuming task, and so will be most grateful for your assistance.

We would appreciate receiving your letter by [relevant date], so that it can be considered in our review.

Thank you for your assistance.

F. *Sample Letter for Internal Letters from Students (required for Major Reviews only)*

Letters will be generated through SmartPath. The following is provided for information only.

Dear [name]:

We are contacting you as the Lecturer Major Review committee of [Lecturer's Name]. Every three to five years, each lecturer in the College of Engineering must undergo a review of their teaching performance. As part of that process, we seek comments about the lecturer's teaching from students, both current and former. You were selected for your confidential input because you were enrolled in a course taught by [Lecturer's Name]. We are interested in positive aspects as well as those needing improvement. We specifically ask that in your letter you state the course name and number, and the semester in which you were enrolled. Comment on [Lecturer's Name]'s ability to:

- Organize and plan the course, and communicate learning goals;
- Convey the material effectively (including presentation in a clear and organized way, clear explanations of difficult concepts, effective answering of student questions); and
- Interact effectively with students, including providing constructive feedback on student work, and assessing the achievement of learning goals.

Please also feel free to elaborate on how [Lecturer's Name] has affected your academic life in other ways as well.

We would appreciate receiving your letter by [relevant date], so that it can be considered in our review.

The decision to be made on [Lecturer's Name]'s review is a very important one, both for the subject and for the College of Engineering. Input from students such as you is vital to our review process. We appreciate your effort to respond as fully as you can to the questions above.

If there is any information that you believe you need for your evaluation, please contact [relevant name and email address].

[Click Here to Upload Letter](#)

We thank you for your time and effort in this very important matter.

G. *Guidelines for Electronic Submission and Casebook Document Format*

Format

General: Margins: 1” top, bottom, left, right
 Font: Times New Roman or Times, size 11

- **Format content**

The format content for the casebooks is outlined in the casebook templates on the ADAA website at: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/lecturers/>.

- **Electronic submission**

- Casebooks must be submitted via SmartPath (<https://engin-umich.mntnpass.com>). For access and questions, contact Sherry Hall at sfolsom@umich.edu. SmartPath training documents can be found at: <https://adaa.engin.umich.edu/lecturers/>.

- **ADAA and Department/Unit Partnership**

We look forward to working with you in this continued collaborative effort. Please call us when you need assistance or have suggestions or recommendations on changes to the process that would be helpful. We want to provide as much assistance to you as possible.

College of Engineering
Casebook Template
for Major Reviews
2021-2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY REPORTS	13
A. COVER LETTER PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR.....	13
<i>A.1 Cover letter prepared by Additional Appointment Department Chair.....</i>	<i>13</i>
B. ONE PAGE RECOMMENDATION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE.....	13
C. OPTIONAL LETTERS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS	13
D. CANDIDATE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION (1 PAGE MAXIMUM).....	13
II. CANDIDATE INFORMATION.....	14
A. PERSONAL	14
B. PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVES.....	14
III. TEACHING	15
A. COMMITTEE’S EVALUATION OF TEACHING	15
B. CANDIDATE’S SUMMARY OF TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS.....	15
<i>B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions to teaching.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>B.2 Courses taught at U of M.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>B.3 Short courses and workshops taught.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>B.4 Other.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>B.5 Comparison Report.....</i>	<i>16</i>
IV. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.....	18
A. COMMITTEE’S EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES.....	18
B. CANDIDATE’S SUMMARY OF SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS	18
<i>B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions through additional administrative or service roles</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>B.2 List committee assignments in the Department, College, and/or University.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>B.3 List additional administrative duties at U of M.....</i>	<i>18</i>
V. OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	19
VI. LETTERS OF EVALUATION	20
A. REVIEWERS INTERNAL TO THE UNIVERSITY.....	20
<i>A.1 Faculty.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>A.2 Students (undergraduate and graduate)</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>A.3 Other personnel.....</i>	<i>20</i>
B. LETTERS OF EVALUATION FROM INTERNAL REVIEWERS.....	20
<i>B.1 CV sent to faculty reviewers.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>B.2 Sample syllabi and/or teaching philosophy statement supplied to faculty reviewers.....</i>	<i>20</i>

I. SUMMARY REPORTS

A. Cover letter prepared by the Department Chair

Department chair's recommendation and recommendation of departmental advisory or executive committee, if appropriate. (The signed letter will be uploaded to SmartPath.) Please address the faculty member's overall contribution to the mission and educational goals of the department or program. Be sure to discuss the following:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management
- Performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.

A.1 Cover letter prepared by Additional Appointment Department Chair

IF the candidate has an additional lecturer appointment other than 0% in another department, a letter of recommendation from that department signed by the department chair must be included (uploaded to SmartPath).

B. One Page Recommendation of the Review Committee

Letter from the Review Committee presenting their conclusions and recommendation. (The signed is uploaded to SmartPath.) This should include a clear assessment of the faculty member's:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management
- Performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.

NOTE: This recommendation should be submitted simultaneously to the candidate and the Department Chair.

C. Optional letters from Committee Members

Include optional letters from Committee members if they disagree with the Committee's recommendation or wish to modify the letter. (The signed letter is uploaded to SmartPath.) Absence of these letters will imply agreement with the Committee's letter.

D. Candidate response to recommendation (1 page maximum)

If the candidate provides a response to the recommendation of the review committee (section I.B.) they will upload the response to SmartPath. The response must be received prior to the submission of the casebook to ADAA.

II. CANDIDATE INFORMATION

A. Personal

A.1 Name

A.2 Degrees (schools, dates, majors, title of masters/doctoral thesis, and name of thesis advisor(s) if applicable)

A.3 Positions at U of M (titles, dates)

A.4 Positions at other institutions or organizations (titles, dates)

A.5 Honors and Awards

B. Professional Objectives

Candidate's statement of professional objectives and brief self-analysis of professional contributions during current Major Review period (**one page maximum**).

III. TEACHING

A. Committee’s Evaluation of Teaching (Two page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate’s teaching including instructional quality, course development and administration, student relationships, and contributions to the profession and overall teaching mission of the academic unit. You must address the broader spectrum of course evaluation data beyond that supplied by Q1 and Q2. Within this evaluation, please address the following specific topics:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management

B. Candidate’s Summary of Teaching Accomplishments

B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions to teaching (Two page maximum)

Please summarize your efforts towards:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management

Because the College of Engineering is committed to educating a diverse student body, please include a discussion of contributions you have made in this area.

B.2 Courses taught at U of M

Provide only course information for time in present rank or since last major review.

- Title/course number
- Course description (1 paragraph per course) and list of course objectives/outcomes

Please use the table provided to insert course information adding rows as needed. You may type over the example shown in *italics*. Candidate may also choose to include online mid-semester student rating data. Provide only course information for time in present rank or since last major review.

Course #	Course Title	Teaching Role	Term
<i>EECS 598</i>	<i>Circuits and Systems</i>	<i>Instructor</i>	<i>Winter 2018</i>

Course #	Term	Q1	Q1631	Q1632	Q1633	Course Quality Avg. (Q1631, Q1632, Q1633)	Q2	Q199	Q217	Q230	Instructor Quality Avg. (Q199, Q217, Q230)	Q4	Q891	#Responses/#Enrolled
----------	------	----	-------	-------	-------	---	----	------	------	------	--	----	------	----------------------

EECS 598	W18	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.6	45/50
-------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------

Question Key:

- Q1. This was an excellent course.
- Q1631. This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.
- Q1632. My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.
- Q1633. I knew what was expected of me in this course.
- Q2. The instructor was an excellent teacher.
- Q199. The instructor explained material clearly.
- Q217. The instructor treated students with respect.
- Q230. The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings.
- Q4. I had a strong desire to take this course.
- Q891. As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (5 = Much Lighter, 4 =Lighter, 3 = Typical, 2 = Heavier, 1 = Much Heavier).

B.3 Short courses and workshops taught

Indicate course, location or institution, date, enrollment, nature of participation.

B.4 Other (optional)

Examples may include: teaching philosophy statement, undergraduate or graduate students advised or assisted outside of coursework; tutoring; mentoring; consulting; educational outreach related to teaching activities; scholarly activities related to teaching responsibilities; publications related to teaching responsibilities.

B.5 Comparison Report (optional)

If the casebook includes discussion relating the candidate’s student evaluations to others’, the data underlying this comparison should be provided in this standard format. The department may obtain the information for a comparison report from the Registrar’s Office.

A Comparison Report offers more precise detail and allows the unit to select appropriate courses for comparison of the candidate’s record with those of departmental peers. Key principles for generating the Report are:

- Group the same or similar courses that have been taught by five of the candidate’s teaching colleagues. The courses selected for this comparison should have been taught during roughly the same time period. Provide a brief rationale (1-2 paragraphs) for the comparison courses and faculty selected for the Comparison Report. Note: If comparison data are not available for the same course, then select comparisons with similar courses in terms of level and size.
- It is permissible to group together different courses taught by the candidate if the unit believes they are similar, and then to establish comparisons to this group of courses.
- The Comparison Report will include either the word “candidate” or the rank of the faculty member whose E&E data you have selected for the comparison. Please do not include the comparison faculty names in the table.

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Course #</i>	<i>Course title</i>	<i>Teaching Role¹</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Enrollment/ Responses</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Q2</i>	<i>Q4</i>
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Faculty 1 (rank)								

Faculty 2 (rank)								
Faculty 3 (rank)								
Faculty 4 (rank)								
Faculty 5 (rank)								

IV. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
(Lecturers III and IV only, as applicable)

A. Committee's Evaluation of Performance of Non-Instructional Duties
(one page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate's additional administrative or service responsibilities

B. Candidate's Summary of Service Accomplishments

B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions through additional administrative or service roles
(one page maximum)

B.2 List committee assignments in the Department, College, and/or University
(committee, duties, dates/time commitment, member or chair status, one sentence description of contributions)

B.3 List additional administrative duties at U of M

**V. OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
(optional)**

Examples may include: service to government or professional organizations, professional development activities including any LEO professional development fund awards received, educational outreach activities not directly related to teaching.

VI. LETTERS OF EVALUATION

A. Reviewers Internal to the University

A.1 Faculty

SmartPath will generate a list of all internal faculty reviewers solicited.

Minimum: two internal faculty evaluations (not to include members of the review committee, evaluators must be at or above the rank of the lecturer)

- If reviewer did not respond with an evaluation, provide a brief explanation in SmartPath.
- SmartPath will insert a sample copy of the letter or email sent to reviewers

A.2 Students (undergraduate and graduate)

SmartPath will generate a list of all student reviewers solicited.

Minimum: four students (any combination of undergraduate and graduate students – currently enrolled or former)

- Explain method of selecting students
- If reviewer did not respond with an evaluation, provide a brief explanation in SmartPath.
- SmartPath will insert a sample copy of the letter or email sent to undergraduates and graduates requesting free form confidential input on candidate's teaching.

A.3 Other personnel (optional)

B. Letters of Evaluation from Internal Reviewers

Letters of Evaluation will be uploaded to SmartPath.

B.1 CV sent to faculty reviewers will be uploaded to SmartPath.

B.2 Sample syllabi and/or teaching philosophy statement supplied to faculty reviewers will be uploaded to SmartPath

College of Engineering

Casebook Template

**for Lecturer
Continuing Reviews**

2021-2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY REPORTS	23
A. COVER LETTER PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR	23
<i>A.1 Cover letter prepared by Additional Appointment Department Chair.....</i>	<i>23</i>
B. RECOMMENDATION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE (3 PAGE MAXIMUM)	23
C. OPTIONAL LETTERS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS.....	23
D. CANDIDATE RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION (3 PAGE MAXIMUM).....	23
E. ANNUAL REPORTS	23
II. CANDIDATE INFORMATION.....	24
A. PERSONAL	24
<i>A.1 Name.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>A.2 Degrees (schools, dates, majors, title of masters/doctoral thesis, and name of thesis advisor(s) if applicable).....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>A.3 Positions at U of M (titles, dates)</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>A.4 Positions at other institutions or organizations (titles, dates)</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>A.5 Honors and Awards</i>	<i>24</i>
B. CANDIDATE STATEMENT (2 PAGE MAXIMUM).....	24
III. TEACHING	25
A. COMMITTEE’S EVALUATION OF TEACHING (2 PAGE MAXIMUM).....	25
B. COURSE MATERIALS INCLUDING SAMPLE SYLLABI	25
C. STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND ANY RESPONSES FROM THE LECTURER TO THOSE EVALUATIONS FOR THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE REVIEW.	25
D. COMPARISON REPORT (OPTIONAL)	25
IV. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.....	27
A. COMMITTEE’S EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES (1 PAGE MAXIMUM)	27
B. CANDIDATE’S SUMMARY OF SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS.....	27
<i>B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions through additional administrative or service roles.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>B.2 List committee assignments in the Department, College, and/or University</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>B.3 List additional administrative duties at U of M.....</i>	<i>27</i>

I. SUMMARY REPORTS

A. Cover letter prepared by the Department Chair

Department chair's recommendation and recommendation of departmental advisory or executive committee, if appropriate. (The signed letter will be uploaded to SmartPath) Please address the faculty member's overall contribution to the mission and educational goals of the department or program. Be sure to discuss the following:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management
- Performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.

A.1 Cover letter prepared by Additional Appointment Department Chair

IF the candidate has an additional lecturer appointment other than 0% in another department, a letter of recommendation in that department signed by the department chair must be included (uploaded to SmartPath).

B. Recommendation of the Review Committee (3 page maximum)

Letter from the Review Committee presenting their conclusions and recommendation. (The signed letter will be uploaded to SmartPath) This should include a clear assessment of the faculty member's:

- Command of and growth in subject field
- Growth in instructional methods and effective interaction with a diverse student body
- Ability to organize and effectively deliver material to students
- Skill for successful design and/or planning of courses and course materials
- Effective course management
- Performance of required non-instructional duties where applicable.

NOTE: This recommendation should be submitted simultaneously to the candidate and the Department Chair.

C. Optional letters from Committee Members

Include optional letters from Committee members if they disagree with the Committee's recommendation or wish to modify the letter. Absence of these letters will imply agreement with the Committee's letter. (The signed letter is uploaded to SmartPath.)

D. Candidate response to recommendation (3 page maximum)

If the candidate provides a response to the recommendation of the review committee (section I.B.), they will upload the response to SmartPath. The response should be received prior to the submission of the casebook to ADAA. Late responses will not be accepted.

E. Annual reports

Annual reports (summary document only, the syllabi and other attachments are not necessary) and any written feedback to the reports for the period covered by the review.

II. CANDIDATE INFORMATION

A. Personal

A.1 Name

A.2 Degrees (schools, dates, majors, title of masters/doctoral thesis, and name of thesis advisor(s) if applicable)

A.3 Positions at U of M (titles, dates)

A.4 Positions at other institutions or organizations (titles, dates)

A.5 Honors and Awards

B. Candidate Statement (2 page maximum)

A brief statement from the lecturer describing his or her performance, teaching philosophy and any professional development activities undertaken over the period covered by the review.

III. TEACHING

A. Committee’s evaluation of teaching (2 page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate’s teaching including instructional quality, course development and administration, student relationships, and contributions to the profession and overall teaching mission of the academic unit. You must address the broader spectrum of course evaluation data beyond that supplied by Q1 and Q2.

B. Course materials including sample syllabi

Please include a representative sampling of syllabi/course materials used for the period covered by the review.

C. Student evaluations and any responses from the lecturer to those evaluations for the period covered by the review (the department will provide this data).

Please use the table provided to insert course information adding rows as needed. You may type over the example shown in *italics*. Candidate may also choose to include online mid-semester student rating data. Provide only course information for time in present rank or since last major/continuing review.

Course #	Course Title	Teaching Role	Term
EECS 598	Circuits and Systems	Instructor	Winter 2018

Course #	Term	Q1	Q1631	Q1632	Q1633	Course Quality Avg. (Q1631, Q1632, Q1633)	Q2	Q199	Q217	Q230	Instructor Quality Avg. (Q199, Q217, Q230)	Q4	Q891	#Responses/#Enrolled
EECS 598	W18	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.6	45/50

Question Key:

Q1. This was an excellent course.

Q1631. This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.

Q1632. My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.

Q1633. I knew what was expected of me in this course.

Q2. The instructor was an excellent teacher.

Q199. The instructor explained material clearly.

Q217. The instructor treated students with respect.

Q230. The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings.

Q4. I had a strong desire to take this course.

Q891. As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (5 = Much Lighter, 4 =Lighter, 3 = Typical, 2 = Heavier, 1 = Much Heavier).

D. Comparison Report (optional)

If the casebook includes discussion relating the candidate’s student evaluations to others’, the data underlying this comparison should be provided in this standard format. The department may obtain the information for the comparison report from the Registrar’s Office.

A Comparison Report offers more precise detail and allows the unit to select appropriate courses for comparison of the candidate’s record with those of departmental peers. Key principles for generating the Report are:

- Group the same or similar courses that have been taught by five of the candidate’s teaching colleagues. The courses selected for this comparison should have been taught during roughly the same time period. Provide a brief rationale (1-2 paragraphs) for the comparison courses and faculty selected for the Comparison Report. Note: If comparison data are not available for the same course, then select comparisons with similar courses in terms of level and size.
- It is permissible to group together different courses taught by the candidate if the unit believes they are similar, and then to establish comparisons to this group of courses.
- The Comparison Report will include either the word “candidate” or the rank of the faculty member whose E&E data you have selected for the comparison. Please do not include the comparison faculty names in the table.

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Course #</i>	<i>Course title</i>	<i>Teaching Role¹</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Enrollment/ Responses</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Q2</i>	<i>Q4</i>
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Candidate								
Faculty 1 (rank)								
Faculty 2 (rank)								
Faculty 3 (rank)								
Faculty 4 (rank)								
Faculty 5 (rank)								

IV. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

(as appropriate)

A. Committee's evaluation of performance of non-instructional duties (one page maximum)

Overall assessment of candidate's additional administrative or service responsibilities

B. Candidate's Summary of Service Accomplishments

B.1 Candidate's own statement of contributions through additional administrative or service roles

(one page maximum)

B.2 List committee assignments in the Department, College, and/or University

(committee, duties, dates/time commitment, member or chair status, one sentence description of contributions)

B.3 List additional administrative duties at U of M