The Chair will set an appropriate schedule for a review, such that the complete dossier will be ready for faculty review at least two (2) weeks before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will, to the degree possible, confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the information provided in the dossier for faculty review prior to the RP meeting for that candidate. Once the dossier is ready for review, all faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured (including tenure-track/tenured faculty, research faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers) will be invited to review the dossier and share their assessments and recommendations concerning the candidate at the RP committee meeting called by the Chair at least one (1) week before the submission deadline to the Dean's Office. The Chair will (i) attend the meeting but not vote, (ii) provide factual information as requested, and (iii) record all of the comments and an anonymous tally of the faculty vote regarding whether or not the candidate should be reappointed or promoted prior to the adjournment of the meeting. The Chair will summarize the discussion and share the document with the voting members of the RP committee via email within three (3) business days of the committee meeting to ensure that the discussion is accurately summarized. This summary document and tally of the votes will be

After considering the feedback from the RP committee and eligible voters' vote, the Chair will decide whether or not to recommend the candidate's
Evaluation statement. The Chair will provide the candidate with a copy of the complete

Demonstration of significant innovation in teaching since last review (e.g., new courses, new experiments and/or laboratories, and/or new methods).

Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.

Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.

Evidence of working knowledge of Program and College requirements, procedures, policies, and standards.

5. Guidelines for Reappointment as Senior Lecturer

Candidates should refer to Section 14.5.e.i Teaching and Advising in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for evaluation criteria. In addition, reappointment as a Senior Lecturer in the Department will be evaluated based upon the following criteria.

Subject to a regular reappointment review.

Evidence that deficiencies identified in the prior review have been addressed.

Good citizenship in terms of service activities within the Department since the last review.

Evidence of maintaining currency in their field of expertise since last review, for example as demonstrated through professional development activities, publications, etc.

Evidence of sustained and highest quality teaching since last review (e.g., consistently good peer and student teaching evaluations, teaching awards, etc.). Demonstration of sustained innovation in classroom since last review (e.g., new courses and/or new methods) teaching. The Department will provide the candidate with teaching evaluations from students and peers as described in Section 6 to assist the candidate in preparing supporting material.

Meeting desired accreditation requirements through coursework and gathering and reporting associated assessment data.

Demonstration of exemplary student advising/mentoring since last review. Candidates should refer to Section 7 of this document when preparing this supporting material.

6. Teaching Evaluations

6.1 Peer evaluations

Prior to each review, the Chair

All peer teaching observations will be done by qualified faculty. (e. g., senior lecturers or

may invite appropriate faculty members from other Departments to provide teaching observations.

The peer evaluators are requested to examine t
                                                For online classes, the candidate is expected to provide peer evaluators access to the online content and the peer evaluators are requested to go through at least one online module in addition to evaluating overall organization of the online course.